BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1848. No. 1.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 21 N. SIXTH STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

☞ FOR TERMS, See last page.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—NO. III.

BY J. T. WALSH.

THE DOMINION OF THE KING.

While the kingdom of Messiah will extend "from the river to the ends of the earth," or land, his *dominion* will be co-extensive with the globe. Thus Daniel says, "I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the SON OF MAN *came with the clouds of heaven*, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him *dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that* ALL PEOPLE, NATIONS, *and* LANGUAGES, *should* SERVE HIM: *his* DOMINION *is an everlasting empire, which shall not pass away, and his* KINGDOM *that which shall not be destroyed.*" Dan. 7: 13, 14. While then, as we before remarked, the kingdom of God, or of Messiah, will be organized on the territory deeded to Abraham by Jehovah, the *dominion*, the authority of the King, will extend over the whole earth. The kingdom of Great Britain, and the *dominion* of the queen, are two things. The one is defined by certain territorial limits, while upon the other the sun never sets! And thus will it be with the kingdom and the dominion of Jesus—"the Lord of Lords, and King of Kings." His kingdom will cover an extent of territory of 300 thousand square miles, but his dominion will be co-extensive with the globe, on which we dwell; so that all people, nations, tribes, and languages, will serve and obey him! This is in harmony with what Paul teaches us, when he says: "Every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus is LORD, to the glory of God the Father." And with the Prophet, who declares, that "the earth shall be filled with the knowledge and glory of God, as the water covers the great deep." And David, by the Spirit, says: "ALL NATIONS whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name." Psalm 86: 9.

THE ADVENT OF THE KING.

Let the reader remember, that Daniel "saw in the night visions, *one like the son of man*, (the Lord Jesus,) CAME WITH THE CLOUDS OF HEAVEN;" and that, at the time indicated, the Ancient of Days, even Jehovah, gave him a kingdom and dominion. This, dear reader, is the object of his *coming*. After he arose from the dead, and had taught his disciples for forty days, the things concerning the kingdom of God, he ascended to the right hand of the majesty in the heavens. His Apostles are present when he ascends from the Mount, to the right hand of his Father. Their eyes and hearts follow him, as he mounts upwards, and is lost amid the silvery clouds of heaven. And, just at this crisis, two heavenly messengers announce the glorious tidings of his second advent. "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up to heaven? this same Jesus who is taken from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts 1: 11. Daniel saw him coming with the *clouds of heaven; a bright cloud* received him out of their sight, when he ascended; and he is to come in *like manner*. "Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also who pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen." Rev. 1: 7.

The doctrine of Messiah's second advent is a cardinal truth of the Christian religion. It is taught; clearly, fully and explicitly taught by Prophets and Apostles. Upon his glorious coming, the hopes, the joys, and the aspirations of the saints of all ages are centered. If Jesus never returns to our world the dead will never be raised; and, if the dead are not raised, they can never be rewarded; and, consequently, "if in this life only we have hope, we are of all men the most miserable." And how any persons, professing the holy religion of Jesus, can doubt or deny this clearly revealed truth, we cannot imagine. And, yet, there are those, professing Christians though they be, who ridicule and scout the idea, that Jesus will ever return to that "inheritance," which, with an oath, Jehovah gave to Abraham and his seed forever. There is a vast amount of infidelity in the so called Christian world; a species of infidelity, too, which is *fatal* to the salvation of all who are its subjects and advocates. In opposition to, and in the face of such infidelity

we affirm *that, if Jesus never returns to this earth; and, if he never reigns over the sons of Adam, the purposes of God concerning the race, will never be accomplished!* As a further proof of the *certainty* of his second coming, we refer our readers to the following testimony from the Lord himself: "Let not your hearts be troubled: you believe in God, believe also in me. In my father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I WILL COME AGAIN and receive you to myself; that where I am, there you may be also." John 14: 3. Here Jesus exhorts his Apostles to be of good cheer; and assures them that he "will come again." The *coming* of our Lord from Heaven, constitutes one important item of the Christian's hope; and, hence, we see it prominently, and constantly brought forward in all the Epistles to the Churches of the apostolic age. "For our conversation is in heaven; from whence, also, we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like to his glorious body, according to the working by which he is able even to subdue all things to himself." Phil. 4: 20, 21. These Philippians "looked for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, from heaven;" and expected *at that time*, "to put on immortality"—to have their "vile bodies changed, and fashioned like the glorious body" of the Son of God. Thus the Apostle John also teaches us: "we know not what we shall be;" or, rather, "it doth not yet *appear* what we shall be; but we know that when he (the Lord) shall appear, we shall be *like him*, for we shall see him as *he is*." And Peter, speaking of the ascension of the Messiah, says: "Whom the heavens must *retain*, until the restitution (or fulfilment) of all the things spoken of by all the holy Prophets, since the world began." (See Acts.) The heavens have *received*, and they must *retain*, the Lord Jesus, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and then they will retain him no longer. He will then rend the heavens and come down in his own glory, the glory of his father, and the glory of all the holy angels. Again: Paul says: "Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth; for ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life SHALL APPEAR, then will you also appear with him in glory." Col. 3: 2—4. Here we have the *fact* of his *appearing* distinctly presented, and the *time* when the saints are to be rewarded plainly stated. "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, *then* shall we also appearwith him in glory." There is no intimation that the saints are rewarded *when they die!* No hint that they go to some unknown abode of blessedness, far beyond the reach of mortals. No intermediate state, where they dwell secure from all the ills and pains of life. But they *are dead;* and their *lives* are hid with Christ in God. And when the last trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised, and the living saints changed; *then*, and not till then, will they appear with the Lord in glory. This is the hope of the Christian! It is this that enables him to bear the frowns of a sinful and adulterous generation, "looking for the blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ."

Paul, in his letter to the Thessalonians, says, they "turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God; and *to wait for his Son from Heaven*, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come." 1 Thess. 1: 9, 10.

To wait for the Son of God to return from Heaven, is then, a part of the Christian's duty. How different is this from the teaching and practice of modern professors? Instead of looking and waiting for Jesus from Heaven, they actually deny the position that he will ever return the second time! They tell us, that he will never pollute his feet again, by treading the soil of earth! Yes! Instead of teaching his glorious advent, and the blessings attending it, they actually deny it; and, in its place, teach that men go to Heaven when they *die!* Thus presenting us with the *monstrosity of a dead man going to Heaven!*

Reader, is not such theology as this worse than Paganism? Can you imagine any thing more gloomy, more absurd, or more irrational than the idea of *dead men* going to Paradise? But this was not the teaching of Paul. He taught the Thessalonians to "wait for Jesus from Heaven;" and, lest some one might imagine it to be a sort of *spiritual* return, he identifies him as one whom God had "*raised from the dead.*" Those who contend for a *spiritual coming*, may, also, with the same consistency contend for a *figurative*, or spiritual resurrection of the Lord Jesus.

At the close of the second chapter of this Epistle, the coming of Christ is again introduced. He says: "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?" As if he had said—"What is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Is it not even this, that ye will be in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming?" This, then, was the *hope*, the *joy*, and "*the crown of rejoicing*" to the Apostle.

Again, he says, at the close of the third chapter, "And the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one towards another, and towards all men, even as we do towards you: *to the end* he may establish your hearts un-

blameable in holiness before God, even our Father, *at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints.*" Again, he says, (fourth chapter, 13—18 verses,) "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them who are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others who have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say to you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain to the coming of the Lord shall not precede them who are asleep. *For the* LORD HIMSELF *will descend from heaven* with a shout, with the voice of an arch-angel, and with the trumpet of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." Those, therefore, who do not believe "the Lord himself will descend from heaven," have not the *hope* nor the faith which animated the hearts of the apostolic saints. They are without hope, and without God in the world. They are Atheists, so far as the *hope* is concerned; and, consequently, have no part nor lot in the matter.

As an additional proof, that the profession of this faith and hope, is a condition of salvation, we refer you to the following language of the Apostle: "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; *and to* THEM THAT LOOK FOR HIM *he will appear the second time without sin unto salvation.*" Heb. 9: 28.

Who are those to whom he will appear the second time, without a sin offering unto salvation? The answer is, "*To them that look for him;*" consequently, those who are not looking for him, will be disappointed when he comes, if they expect to be subjects of salvation.

"POLYTHEISM NOT PECULIAR TO PAGANS, OR WITCH-CRAFT UNVEILED."—NO. I.

"Then said Saul unto his servants, seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may go to her, and inquire of her." 1 Sam. 28: 7.

The following exposition of "THE WITCH OF ENDOR CASE," by Mr. HENRY FITZ, is the best, the most conclusive we have ever seen. Those who advocate the popular hypothesis, concerning the state of the dead, have brought this case forward, and triumphantly asserted that it proved the *consciousness of the dead.* How far this view of the question is sustained by this case, will appear in the following extracts, and the subsequent remarks:

"The phraseology of our text, is indicative of the true signification of the pretensions of an IMPOSTOR *of the higher class,* such as the old woman of Endor. '*A woman that hath a familiar spirit.*' And Saul's request, when he obtained an interview with the WITCH, explains the *powers* which were arrogated by the deceiver. 'And he (Saul) said, I pray thee, DIVINE UNTO ME *by the* FAMILIAR SPIRIT, and bring me *him* up, whom I shall name unto thee.' The connexion informs us, that 'when Saul saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled. And when Saul inquired of the LORD, the LORD *answered him not, neither by* DREAMS, *nor by* URIM, *nor by the* PROPHETS.' In this strait, Saul acted as affirmed in our text. It appears that the Witch of Endor, the better to carry on the work of deception, graduated her pretensions on a scale to equal or exceed the united powers delegated by JEHOVAH *to his* PRIESTS *and* PROPHETS; and, as a matter of course, acting in open *defiance of God,* and arrogating powers in a direct competition with God's appointed servants, the Witch of Endor gave out that she could call up *spirits* at her will; who, at her bidding, and as her *servants,* would fulfil her commands, do her pleasure, and predict future events. Therefore she pretended to a supernatural power; and was, *to her dupes,* in the place of the Supreme God. All, therefore, who inquired of the Witch of Endor, *literally* PRAYED, addressing their petition to an *infamous impostor,* and violated the command of JEHOVAH —'Thou shalt have no other Gods before me.' And the command was imperative. 'Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.' 'He that sacrificeth unto *any* God, save unto the Lord only, he shall be utterly destroyed." (Ex. 20: 3; 22: 18, 20.

The Witch of Endor, as I shall show, was an *arrant impostor;* and Saul was her *stupid dupe.* The only power she professed, was a *natural gift;* a faculty which was the result of a cause in perfect conformity to the laws of nature, as established by nature's God; and the simple effect of a peculiar physical conformation. Samson was endowed with a physical energy, a power greater than was possessed by any of his contemporaries; or by any other man before or since his time, that sacred or profane history has given any account of. Samson, however, made no pretensions to a supernatural power. He acknowledged JEHOVAH as the author of his being, and his prayer was to his God, the God of the whole earth, for support and assistance. Not so the impostor of Endor. She wickedly, because falsely, arrogated powers which belonged to JEHOVAH *only.*

When Saul prayed to the Witch, he said, "I pray thee divine unto me by the familiar spirit." Saul's prayer was a full acknowledgment, a more than tacit confession, of the truth of the impostor's pretensions. *A definition of the term shows the* FOLLY *and* WICKEDNESS *of Saul.* DIVINATION: *Prediction or foretelling of future things.* All future things are

secret things. It is remarkable, that Moses when he warned the Israelites of the consequences of *idolatry*, affirmed of *secret* things that, "The *secret things belong* unto the Lord our God; bu those *things which are revealed, belong* unto us and to our children." Deut. 29:29.

The term DIVINE signifies, "partaking of the nature of God; proceeding from God, not natural, not human; excellent in a supreme degree, presageful." And this term, (*so says the complaisant lexicographer!*) used as a substantive, signifies, "A minister of the gospel, a priest, a clergyman; a man skilled in divinity, a theologian"—almost *a* WITCH!—reader! And TO DIVINE, signifies "to foretell future events." *And* THIS IS *precisely* what Saul wanted the Witch of Endor to do, by the aid or agency of her familiar spirit.

The history of Saul's conference with the Witch of Endor, has been perverted by ignorance and superstition to miserable ends. There *must* be witches, says ignorance and superstition, for the *Bible says so*, and then the Witch of Endor is made to sit for the likeness which a diseased imagination sketches and portrays. Pictorial fancy is never more busy than in the service of superstition. The black *arcanum* of stupid ignorance, is always pregnant with awful or mysterious secrets; which can be fished out from their hidden recesses, only by the magical wand of some *outrageous booby*, or *stupid fool*. In works of fiction, consistency has been observed in the relation of cause and effect. The imaginative author of the celebrated Eastern Tales, "The Arabian Night's Entertainments," in all his fantastic pranks, which his literary automatons play for the amusement of the idle, is careful to move a mighty Genii, when he is desirous of subserving an important end. He operates by causes as great as his aim. But the materials and machinery of which modern ignoramuses manufacture their witches, are too bungling to make mouse traps. True, they sometimes catch *men!*

There are certain particulars which have an important relation to our subject, and require a full consideration before we pass to a final decision. And, previously to attending to these matters, I will state, for the advantage of a subsequent contrast, certain opinions which have been expressed by commentators, and by other clergymen, of the subject in question. I conceive the erroneous views on this subject, to have resulted from an absurd notion, that the Deity used the Witch of Endor as an instrument, to announce to Saul his approaching doom. That Saul, who, when the subject of extraordinary excitement, *played the mad man*, and was notorious for his obstinacy and absurdity, under the alarming circumstances which his peculiar and excitable imagination had arrayed as adverse to his prospects in his apprehension of the result of the expected battle; spurred on by desperation, his mind hostile at all times to every thing, and every suggestion which opposed his views and wishes; as a last resort, should look for something to quiet or soothe the agony of his forebodings, and seek a reputed witch or sorceress, is very reasonable. The character of Saul harmonized with his proceeding; and the witch was no more absurd in her pretensions, than was Saul in his expectations. His fate had been predicted by the prophet Samuel in his life time. Saul's son Jonathan had made a covenant with David, and considered him as the successor to the throne, when the denunciation of the prophet against his father should be accomplished. The fact was notorious, that Saul was rejected by God, and David preferred as King of Israel. Big portents distracted the mad and rejected king Saul, and his hopes had perished.

On the other hand, how does the character of JEHOVAH agree with the Witch of Endor? Would God employ such an instrument, and send Samuel back at her bidding, to counsel a mad man? Would God confirm her wicked and preposterous pretensions, to a Divine or super-human power, by *aiding her* in her abominable incantations? No. And the opinions that the witch really succeeded in calling up a spirit from the dead, and that God actually chose a witch, instead of a prophet, to communicate his will, already expressed by the prophet Samuel, in all that respected the wicked king of Israel, is derogatory to the character of the Supreme Being, contrary to reason, and unsupported by a single fact. No wonder that superstitious people have believed in witches calling spirits from the tomb, when their spiritual teachers have laid the foundation of such monstrous absurdities.

Let the simple truth, unvarnished by superstitious opinions, be seen; and the real facts, undisguised by the colouring of a diseased imagination, speak for themselves.

The first statement in relation to Saul, after mention is made of the two armies, that of the Philistines, and of the Israelites, being pitched for battle, is a *key* to the whole subject. "*And when Saul saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly trembled.*" He had a presentment of his approaching ruin. He knew that David, who on former occasions had aided in achieving his victories, was then with a band of valiant men, in the camp of his enemy. The Lord had abandoned him as predicted by the prophet Samuel; for no answer could be obtained either by the agency of the Lord's prophets, or by the priesthood. And it was under this stress of alarming circumstances, his heart greatly trembling, that he

went, with two men as his attendants, to consult the Witch of Endor. The circumstances in relation to the condition of the Witch, reason must sanction, as all in her favour; and the dupe to her deceptions, as eminently fitted by fear and desperation, to yield his reason on the first summons; and follow the dictates which a trembling expectation, and a diseased imagination, had already made him a slave to; for he was prepared to do any thing within the bounds of superstition, and to believe any thing that consummate impudence, and reckless impiety dared venture upon."

In our next we shall present the *circumstances*, alluded to in the preceding paragraph, which in our estimation, will settle the question before us.

J. T. WALSH.

PROPHETIC PERIODS.—NO. IV.

In my last number I endeavored to show that one grand cause of confusion in explaining the prophecies, is the confounding *Khosrau*, or Cyrus the Great, with *Coresch*, or the Cyrus of the Scriptures.

Another source of error and confusion is the assumption that the seventy weeks, of Dan. 9, and the seven and sixty-two weeks with the *one* week cover the same identical period. Let us look at what Gabriel says of the seventy weeks. It seems to me he gives us clearly their termination, without supposing the seven and sixty-two come in to explain them. He says:—"Seventy weeks are determined [or, if any one likes the expression better—"cut off"] upon THY PEOPLE and upon THY HOLY CITY to finish [or, as in the margin—*restrain*] transgression, and to make an end of sins," &c.

The first remark I make here, is—these seventy weeks certainly relate to "the holy city," as well as other matters; and as they must have their termination at the latest event included in a series of events, they cannot end till they arrive at that event. The latest events, in the series here mentioned, are the giving up of the holy city and Daniel's people for their sins and transgressions. Till that time their apostacy was not complete, nor the efforts for their reformation abandoned. The apostles of Christ, after his death and resurrection, when he was about to ascend into heaven, were commanded to "begin at Jerusalem" in proclaiming the tidings of the kingdom of God; and it is left on record that "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith." Acts 6: 7. Nor did our Lord ever direct his disciples to abandon the Jews, until they should "see Jerusalem compassed about with armies:" that was the signal for them to leave "the holy city," then, at that time, given up of God—then had "transgression" come to its full, and was to be "restrained" no longer. At the time Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans, A.D. 66 or 67, the Jewish historian asserts of his countrymen in general—"That they were abandoned to all manner of wickedness—that it was impossible to invent any villainy that was not commonly practised—that they seemed to strive, one with another, which could exceed in impiety and injustice—that the powerful oppressed the weak, and the meaner sort massacred the rich, and plundered their possessions." He describes the two factions, who shared the dominion of the city at the time of the seige, as the most execrable villains that ever were heard of; and declares—"That it surpassed his ability to relate all the proofs of their wickedness—that in his opinion no other city ever suffered so much misery, nor any people ever existed so barbarous and inhuman—that he could not forbear expressing, though with pain and reluctance, his belief, that if the *Romans* had not come, yet the city would have been destroyed some other way, by an earthquake, or deluge, or, like Sodom and Gomorrah, by lightning; for the inhabitants were more wicked."

Such was the pitch of wickedness at which they had arrived when the Roman "armies compassed about Jerusalem." That was the point to which our Saviour referred in addressing his disciples; and also, when he said to the Pharisees, Matt. 23: 32, "Fill ye up then [or as some read it—ye are filling up] the measure of your fathers," which work they had fully accomplished by killing them which were sent unto them by our ascending Lord, after his resurrection: to that point of time, it is clear to my mind, Gabriel looked in the prophecy of "seventy weeks upon thy people and upon thy holy city." Those seventy weeks *terminated* when the Roman armies compassed about Jerusalem.

I have endeavored to show in a previous number that Darius Nothus and Darius the son of Ahasuerus are identical, or the same person. No fact of those times, in chronology, is more undisputed than that Darius Nothus came to the throne B. C. 424. That year Gabriel made the communication of the seventy weeks to Daniel; and the next year, the second of Darius, the seventy years desolations of Jerusalem terminated: See Zech. 1: 7, 12, 16.

If, then, we commence the seventy weeks, 490 years, with the time the communication was made to Daniel, that is, B. C. 424, they will terminate A. D. 66, the year in which some lay the time that the Roman armies commenced the seige of Jerusalem; or, if we begin the seventy weeks, at the end of the "desolations of Jerusalem," in the second year of Darius, B. C. 423, then the 490 years would end A. D. 67, which is the probable time the siege by the Romans commenced; there, I am satis.

fied, from present light, the seventy weeks terminated when Daniel's "people and the holy city" were given up for their sins, and their "transgressions" were no longer "restrained." When the period of seventy years' desolation by Babylon and the Medes terminated, God, by Gabriel, designated another period of seventy weeks, of years, for a further trial of Daniel's people and continued favour to the holy city; if this proved ineffectual, they would then be visited with more awful judgments than ever before; "and the people of the prince that shall come [the Romans] shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And he [*the prince* of the people that shall come and destroy the city and sanctuary,] shall confirm the covenant with many for *one* week." How shall the Roman prince do this? I answer, By fulfilling the words of prophecy spoken by our Lord, in relation to the destruction of Jerusalem and the distress of that people. Thirty years had passed since our Lord uttered his predictions of Jerusalem's overthrow; many Hebrew converts had apostatized; and many others were *wavering*, as is evident from Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, which was written about A. D. 63. From the siege of Jerusalem, *one week*, or seven years, was allotted to show how exactly the words of Christ should be fulfilled, whereby the wavering Christians would be confirmed in the covenant with Christ, and established in the truth that he was really the Messiah—the Son of God.

A very marked point in the prophecy of Gabriel, was that—"In the midst of the week he [*the prince* of the people that should come to destroy the city] shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease." Up to the time that Titus took the city, the sacrifice and oblation had continued to be offered on the Jewish altar; and the Christians, who were Jews, continued for some length of time, if not up to the very time Jerusalem was destroyed, to offer the offerings under the law. See Acts 21: 17–26. Perhaps nothing short of the destruction of the temple could have fully broken off these Jewish converts from continuing to offer the offerings and sacrifices under the law; but God so ordered it that those sacrifices and oblations should cease; and this was done when the "he" [the prince of the people that came] took the city in July or August, A. D. 70, at which time the temple was burned and all its worship ended, or was made to "cease," so that "the sacrifice and oblation" was offered no more. And this was done just about three and an half years after the ending of the seventy weeks, or from the commencement of the siege. Thus, the seventy weeks ended, A. D. 67, in the beginning of the year, at which time the *one* week, a distinct period, began. Cessation of the daily sacrifice in the temple, according to Greswell, July, A. D. 70; that is the end of the first half week. Recapture of Masada, A. D. 73, when the war ended, and the one week terminated.

By these remarks it will be seen that I understand the seventy weeks and the one week to be connected or linked together, forming a period of seventy-one weeks; and that they were not given us as having any thing to do with the date of the crucifixion of our Lord, as has *generally* been supposed, though not universally. TERTULLIAN, SULPITIUS SEVERUS, SCALIGER, DR. PARRY, and others, carry the seventy weeks down to the destruction of Jerusalem.

The seven and sixty-two weeks I view as a distinct period from the seventy, but must defer the consideration of that subject till another time.

PHILOSOPHY OF MAN.—NO. I.

By J. T. WALSH.

Man as he Was.

When man came from the hand of his Maker, he was physically, morally, and intellectually good. He was in the image of his Creator, and He pronounced him, and all the things He had made, '*very good.*' We have said he was made in the image of God; and it may be asked, 'what was that image?' The popular answer is, that 'man was made in the moral image of God.' This may be true, but we are not prepared to say that this is all the truth upon this subject. About this, however, we will not now debate. We ask, what was his physical, moral, and intellectual condition? Was he a *mortal* or an *immortal being?* Or, was he neither mortal nor immortal, but in a state of *susceptibility?* But, before we go any farther, we will define the term immortality. There are several words used in Greek expressive of this idea, three of which are thus defined by Greenfield, viz: *Aphtharsea*, *Aphthartos*, and *Aphthoria:* incorruptibility, incorruptness, by implication, immortality, with the accessory idea of felicity; incorruptible, immortal; imperishable, undying, enduring, incapability of decay, &c. That which is immortal, cannot die, because it is incorruptible; and, therefore, undying. If Adam were immortal, why did God place the tree of life in the garden to perpetuate his existence? Perpetuate that which cannot die! A perpetuation of that which is immortal, is like preventing from death that which cannot die! That Adam and Eve were not immortal is further evident from the fact, that they were commanded to be fruitful, multiply, and replenish the earth—Gen. 1: 18. This fact, if we had no other, would be

sufficient to prove that man was not immortal, for immortal beings never propagate their species. This doctrine is clearly taught by Jesus Christ, for he said to the Sadducees on one occasion, "those who shall be count-worthy of that life, (life eternal,) neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are like the angels; neither shall they die any more." This is eternal life. Such is the purport, if not the language, of what Jesus, the Messiah, taught upon this interesting subject. The angels do not propagate ther species, neither do the demons, or fallen spirits, propagate theirs. They are not constituted like man. But, perhaps, some one will ask the question, by way of objection: "Are the demons, or fallen spirits *now* immortal?" We might ask the question:—Were they ever immortal? When did they fall? Evidently before man was created. May it not be true that immortality was offered to them, upon some conditions, as it was to man, and that they forfeited their right and title to it? "How?" you will ask? By transgression—by not keeping their first state. May it not be true, that the heavenly messengers have immortality now, because they kept their *first* state? Does not the term *first*, argue that they were to have a *second* state? And may they not now be in possession of that state? And may not that state be immortality? But, be this as it may, if the fallen angels ever had the gift of immortality, which we think is exceedingly doubtful, it does not follow as a necessary consequence, that they have it now, for He, who bestows this gift can take it away when it is forfeited by disobedience. God never did, and never intended, we presume, to constitute any thing so as for that thing to live independent of Him, and thus be self-existent. God alone is absolutely immortal, and he proposes to make his creatures so, in a subordinate sense, upon conditions; and when those conditions are not complied with, the title is forfeited, and the gift withdrawn. God can take away whatever he has the power of bestowing. But to return, we have seen that man was not immortal; the question now is, was he mortal? He could not have been mortal, for that which is mortal is necessarily compelled to die, without a miracle! And in this case, and upon this hypothesis, man would have died if he had never sinned at all. This, then, cannot be the true state of the case. Adam was, therefore, in a state of *susceptibility*—mortality and immortality were placed before him, and he was at liberty to make his own selection. He enjoyed life, physical, moral and intellectual perfection—and just before him God placed on the one hand, death, mortality, corruption; and on the other hand, eternal life, incorruptibility, immortality. This was the original state of Adam. He was, then, originally in a state of *susceptibility*; and the continuation of his being, as well as his enjoyment of immortality and eternal life, was made to depend upon his obedience. By disobedience he was cut off from the life-perpetuating tree, and, therefore, dying, he died. God created man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath, or spirit of lives, and he became a living soul—a person, living, rational, and intellectual being. Adam, then, was a candidate for immortality and eternal life. He was a probationer, and by obedience alone could inherit those inestimable blessings. Therefore, if Adam had not partaken of the interdicted fruit, when it was presented to him by Eve, he would have lived, and she alone would have perished in her guilt. And if they had propagated their species before they fell, their obedience would not have saved their children from falling by their disobedience; nor would the disobedience of the parents, in that event, have involved their children, who were already born, in their guilt. Each one would have had to obey for himself, in order to live for ever. For the children to share in the consequences of their father's sin, they must be in his loins at the time of his transgression. And this was the case with Adam, and hence the fatal result. After Adam sinned, if he had partaken of the tree of life, he would have lived for ever in a state of actual rebellion against God. But, in this case, he would have evaded, or escaped from the law. Then the penalty of the law, which he had violated, would not have been inflicted upon him, and God, as a consequence would not have been just. But God never lets a sinner escape from justice. He had said, "The day you eat thereof (of the tree of knowledge) you shall surely die." The sentence is passed—the law is infringed, and now unless a ransom is provided, the rebel must be executed—must die, and be no more. The penalty, or punishment of the law, was death—the death of the whole man. We are aware, that some persons are of opinion that the penalty of the law was moral death, but this is absurd, and, therefore, untrue. Moral death is a state of sin; and this view of the matter would make God say, "The day you eat of the interdicted fruit, you shall surely be in a state of sin." A state of sin, it is true, followed the transgression as a necessary consequence, but the necessary consequence of an action, and the penalty of that action, are two things; the one flows necessarily, and the other is inflicted. Besides, it is probable that Adam was as morally depraved after he resolved to eat and before he eat, as he was after he eat; but after he eat, he was both morally and legally depraved and guilty. To make the penalty then moral death would be like identifying cause and effect, which is illogical, unphilosophical, and unscrip-

tural. The practice of spiritualizing every thing has almost reduced the Bible to a perfect jargon. Words are to have their primary meaning, unless there is a clear and positive necessity for departing from it. In this case there is no such necessity; and, therefore, it is a literal death.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1848.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—This paper appears before our readers in a *new form*—a super-royal octavo, of 16 pages. We have made the change from the Quarto, because we think the present form is neater; because we can enlarge to 24 pages without increasing the amount of postage to subscribers; and because it is a more convenient form for reading and binding. It is our intention to increase the amount of matter, so soon as the funds contributed will warrant it, by using more small type; and when we have increased to the most desirable extent in that way, to enlarge to 24 pages; and then, if more matter still is called for, to publish twice in each month. In this way we hope, ere long, to give our patrons a paper equal to any published, and at a cheaper rate than has yet been offered them. The improvements intended will depend upon the patronage given. At present we are encouraged to go forward. Let the friends of the Examiner continue as they have begun, and we have no fears for its pecuniary support; we feel no misgivings but that they will thus continue, and we trust to make the paper worthy of patronage. We solicit well written articles for its columns, but cannot pledge ourselves to publish all that is written, though we hope to do justice to our correspondents.

It will be understood that each of the Editors of this paper is *alone* responsible for the matter or sentiments he furnishes editorially. Correspondents themselves are responsible for their communications, though the Editors claim the right of judging as to the expediency of publishing them. No communication will be excluded merely because it contains sentiments differing from the Editors; indeed they, doubtless, differ themselves on some points, but each will speak his own views in his own language.

A MONTHLY PAPER, at the price we furnish the Examiner, is a saving to the subscribers of the entire subscription cost of a weekly paper; as the *postage* on a weekly one, when sent 100 miles, is 78 cents, while our monthly Examiner costs but 68 cents, including the postage to the greatest distance: and if taken by companies of 5, 8, or 13, it is still less Another advantage of a monthly over a weekly paper is, it is read more thoroughly; the reader is not so likely to be weary of its contents. A weekly comes so often that persons in business hardly have time to do anything more than to run it over hastily before its contents are crowded out of mind by the arrival of another, and the first is left undigested.

THE POSTAGE on the Examiner in its present form is newspaper postage only: *see that you pay no more.*

FOR TEN DOLLARS sent us free of expense, before the first of February, we will send to any person, or company of persons, *thirty* copies of the Examiner, monthly, for one year. For general *terms* of the Examiner see last page.

WRITE PLAIN the *names* and *Post Office address* of new subscribers: ☞ *Do not forget it.* ☜

EXPLANATION:—All articles in the Examiner furnished by the *Assistant Editor* bear his signature, or initials, J. T. W. All other articles, not credited or selected, are by the *Editor*. The residence of the Editor is 18 CHESTER Street. Address, "GEO. STORRS, PHILADELPHIA, PA." Those who choose to address the Assistant Editor, will direct "JOHN T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA."

EARLY ISSUE.—The present number has been put to press earlier than usual for two reasons. First, the Editor expects to be in New York city the last Sabbath of December and the first in January. Second, to give as much time as possible, before issuing the February number, to see how many new subscribers our friends will furnish for the new volume, so that we need print only so many copies as may be wanted. We have printed an extra quantity for January, and hope the returns will justify us in continuing the same or a greater number. A few copies are sent to persons *not* subscribers: they will understand we shall send them no more unless we hear from them. We have not had a solitary "discontinuance" since our regular monthly issue, and several have done nobly in sending new subscribers. One brother has sent 18, and another 27 since our December number went to press.

"THE ASPECTS OF PHRENOLOGY ON REVELATION; or, *Materialism, Fatalism, Regeneration, Creeds, Atheism, The operation of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of men,* and HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY, *Philosophically considered, in a series of Lectures,* BY J. T. WALSH." Such is the Title of an Octavo pamphlet of 74 pages, published by Br. Walsh, Richmond,

Va., 1846. It is for sale at No. 21, North Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Price, 25 cents.

We have not had time to examine this work thoroughly, but from what we have read, think it is well worth the price it costs. The four lectures on the Philosophy of Man, and of the Intermediate State, to say nothing of the seven others, are very valuable. We commence extracts from the work, in this number of the Examiner, under the head of Philosophy of Man.—No. 1.

CHRISTIAN ADMONITION.—We esteem those our best friends who in a Christian spirit tell us our faults. We thank the brother who in that spirit has cautioned us to "avoid sarcasm." We will do the best we can in that respect, though we do not consider all sarcasm sinful. Elijah used it with the prophets of Baal; and others, in the Scriptures, sometimes employed it: some men *feel* it, when all argument is lost upon them. It is true, however, that it seldom converts the subjects to whom it is applied. "Brethren, Pray for us, and "admonish" us in love: we will love you the better for it, and trust we shall be the more useful in consequence of it: and usefulness, if we know ourselves, is our object and aim.

WONDERS!!!

THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES NOT INSPIRED.

In a certain paper, at Boston, Mass., of Nov. 20th, we find an effort to destroy the testimony of Solomon, with regard to the state of the dead.

That paper begins by the broad insinuation that the Book of Ecclesiastes is not inspired. It says, it is—"A book that makes no claim to being written by inspiration of God, for the purpose of asserting true doctrines, though it is doubtless given for instruction, by presenting a true record of the experience and errors of Solomon, during the 'days of his vanity,' and perhaps of his conversion:" but, it adds—"There is not a 'thus saith the Lord' in the whole book."

Will the said paper, please inform us how many more books there are in the Bible in which there is not a "Thus saith the Lord in the whole book?" Ecclesiastes is not the only one in that predicament. Is that the test of their inspiration?

"SOLOMON A DEIST."

The same paper says—"Solomon" was "a deist!" The words used are:—"The experience and views of Solomon, while a deist, when he 'said in his heart,' 'there is no remembrance of the wise more than of the fool for ever,' (2: 15, 16,) that 'man hath no pre-eminence above a beast' (3: 18—22,) when he seems not to have a thought of any 'portion' beyond 'the grave,' (9: 9, 10,) these are not our experience, or our views."

Here Solomon is distinctly declared to have been "a deist" when he entertained the views referred to in the texts cited. Those texts are amazingly garbled in the quotation of them; but, as chapter and verse are given us we can turn to the Bible and read for ourselves. The quotations are put in such a form that had we not known what paper was speaking we should have thought it was some Market street [illegible]el. Just let each one turn to those texts and see if Solomon uttered such sentiments as are attributed to him in the garbled quotations. It did not suit the purpose designed to quote those texts entire. In the same connection, chap. 3: 17, Solomon says—"I said in my heart, God shall judge the righteous and the wicked." Is that the language of "a deist?" He proceeds to say, Eccl. 3: 18, 19, 20, "I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men, that God might manifest them, and that they might see that they themselves are beasts. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other: yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again."

We see here, that Solomon was speaking of man in his corruptible state—*in death*—there, he affirms, "man hath no pre-eminence above a beast," and he affirms a truth which cannot be disproved; so he is denounced as "a deist."

The quotation of Eccl. 9: 9, 10, to prove Solomon "a deist" is most unfortunate for the purpose. In which of those verses lies the proof of his deism? Is it the ninth? It reads thus:—"Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity, which he hath given thee under the sun, all the days of thy vanity: for that is thy portion in this life, and in thy labour which thou takest under the sun." Is that deism? In what part of it are we to look for the proof that Solomon was a deist? Is it in *living* with his wife? Or, living *joyfully* with her? Or, *loving* her? Or, for loving "*her all the days of life?*" Or was it for saying God had given such a state as a "*portion in this life?*" If the paper in question can make out any *deism* in either or all these propositions I am sure its "views and experience" are not "ours." Solomon does not intimate in this verse that there is not "any portion beyond the grave." But he does express the happiness that a good man may have with a good wife, whom he loves, in "*this life.*" Does he differ from other writers who are inspired? See Psa. 128: 1—4, "Blessed

is every one that feareth the Lord; that walketh in his ways. For thou shalt eat the labour of thine hands: happy shalt thou be, and it shall be well with thee. Thy wife shall be as a fruitful vine by the side of thine house: thy children like olive plants round about thy table. Behold, thus shall the man be blessed that feareth the Lord." Was David "a deist" too? See also Eph. 5: 25, 28. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it: so ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself." Was Paul "a deist," as well as David and Solomon? Or, is Paul's testimony worthless, because there is not a "Thus saith the Lord" "in the whole" Epistle?

But perhaps the proof of Solomon's deism is in the tenth verse: Eccl. 9: 10, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest."

That is undoubtedly deism, if the said Boston paper is "orthodox." Did it "*know*" that the word here translated *grave* is "*Sheol*" in Hebrew; answering exactly to "*Hades*" in Greek; both signifying the invisible state of the dead? I suppose it did *know* that fact. Ah! here is Solomon's deism: he taught positively and unqualifiedly that the dead are *unconscious*—that they have no "*knowledge* nor wisdom!" Dreadful heresy!! Solomon was a dreadful deist! He wasn't *inspired!* But why was he "a deist"? and why was he not inspired? Because, he does not agree with Boston orthodoxy! I confess I can see no better reason—the paper in question has offered none better. If that organ speaks by inspiration of God, then, certainly, Solomon was a deist, and not inspired: but then, what becomes of their grand argument, "the spirit shall return to God who gave it"? For this same uninspired, deistical Solomon is the author of that text, and in immediate connection with the others.

THE "ANTITHESIS."

"But," says the Boston paper, "admitting Solomon did speak 'by inspiration of God,' in this case, does it teach that death is 'the utter extinction of all being,' so that there is nothing in man to be in any state, conscious or unconscious, asleep or awake? This is a most marvellous paragraph, truly. Who contends "that there is nothing in man to be in any state," &c.? Man when dead is asleep and unconscious; and if "Solomon did speak by inspiration of God," a dead man is in *sheol*, without wisdom or knowledge, as plainly taught, both in the 10th and 5th verses. The argument proceeds upon the fifth verse as follows:

"The whole verse contains as perfect an antithesis as words could be made to express—look at the two parts of this antithesis: 'For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not anything.' If one part is to be understood in the absolute sense, the other must be so understood. If one part of the text means that all the dead are incapable of knowing anything, all the dead while under the power of death, the spirit that returns to God as well as the dust that returns to dust, then the other part of the text means that all the living, while men live on the earth, must know that they shall die. Does the word of God make no exception to the general truth; the 'living know that they shall die?' Do all our brethren '*know* they shall die?' If not, the text cannot be understood in an absolute sense. It has been, and still is, a general truth, that the dead know not anything; but it does not follow that there are no exceptions to this general 'state of the dead.'"

The Boston paper, here, if we understand it, acknowledges that it is a *general truth* that the dead have no knowledge, but pleads there are exceptions. It is, then, something more than half converted; for, heretofore, it would not acknowledge that any of the dead were unconscious; now, it seems to admit that *generally* they are. We are glad to see that it "sees men as trees walking," and hope it may soon see all things clearly.

But the "antithesis" fails in the application made of it. It is asked, "do our brethren *know* they shall die?" and added—"If not, the text cannot be understood in the absolute sense." Now our brethren do *know* they shall die, unless God works *a miracle* to prevent: they know God has wrought such a miracle in the case of Enoch and Elijah, and they believe he will work such a miracle in the case of all Christ's disciples that are "alive and remain unto" his second coming; and they "know" that nothing but a miracle can preserve them from the laws of mortality. Now if the Boston paper can show that God works miracles to keep some dead men *conscious*, then it will have a "*perfect antithesis*," and not till then.

On this topic it concludes its remarks in the following sublime language:

"Now it is only by assuming that this detached portion [Eccl. 9: 5,] is to be understood in the absolute sense, that it can be made to render any support to the doctrine that the dead have experienced such an utter extinction of all being, as to be incapable of knowing anything. The doctrine can be got out of that text only by a process like that said to have been discovered by Elias Smith, FOR GETTING CIDER OUT OF COTTON WOOL, *viz.*: BY FIRST PUTTING CIDER INTO IT."

"WITNESS TO THE TRUTH."

BY CHARLES FITCH.

"*He being dead yet speaketh.*" Heb. 11 : 4.

The following letter, though published in the Bible Examiner, old series, is so valuable, and, at this time, important, that we republish it; hoping it may quicken some, and carry conviction to others, who having seen the light have apostatized from it through shame, or some other cause.

PHILADELPHIA, July 3d, 1844.

Dear Bro. Storrs :—You remember that our blessed and adorable Lord and Master said, at the bar of Pilate, "for this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness to the truth." He having left the world, it is now the business of all his followers who hope for eternal life through faith in Him, to walk in his steps, and like him to feel and act on the admission that the end of their present life is to "bear witness to the truth." For bearing witness to the truth our glorious Lord was crucified by wicked men who hated the truth, and would not bear its light. For bearing witness to the truth, fifty or sixty millions of his followers have sacrificed their lives, sealing their testimony with their blood. It is still as truly as it ever was, the sole business of Christ's followers to bear witness to the truth, and still there are conflicts to be sustained, and sacrifices to be made, and trials to be endured, by those who will be faithful witnesses for Christ. It is true that such are not now called to a martyr's death, and yet I fully believe that the faithful witness for truth in this day, will find himself in the midst of conflicts and trials, from unbelieving men, who hate the truth, which will make him feel sometimes that it would be a relief and a privilege, to be permitted to seal his testimony with his blood, and thus end the struggle. It may be said, doubtless with truth, that such may not know how they would feel if really brought to the test; yet, in the midst of their struggles the feeling will come over them at times with great power, that it would be gain to die for the truth and sleep in Jesus till the resurrection.

It has often been a great pleasure to me, to learn from those who have come out from preconceived opinion, and prejudice, and hatred of truth, to stand up fearlessly in its defence, and meet the scorn and derision and hatred and contempt of those professing Godliness, who were yet haters of truth, the trials and conflicts through which they passed, and the convictions and feelings and facts, which have led them to their present position. It has also been a sweet relief and consolation to my own mind, in the midst of such conflicts as I have passed through for the truth's sake, to be permitted to relate to others the dealings of the Lord with me, and the process of mind through which I have been led to see, embrace and defend truth, for which truth's sake I have been scorned and set at nought, by those professed friends of Christ who hate it.

I know that with many who claim to be Christ's, and who make high pretensions to an unusual acquaintance with spiritual things; fanatic, fool, maniac, and knave, are epithets sufficiently kind, to be applied to those who will sacrifice all for truth that is unpopular; and that to say they are the dupes of designing men and under the influence of the devil, is a common thing, and those who say these cruel things are righteous in their own eyes for having done so, and feel that they ought on account of them to stand higher than before in the estimation of God.

But, thanks be to God, there are hearts in the world who have in them enough of the meekness and gentleness of Christ, to appreciate the feelings of those who are willing to sacrifice all for truth; and to listen with candor and kindness to what they have to say in its defence. It is for such hearts that I write, and should I be the means of leading such, to clearer and more consistent views of any precious truth of God than they have hitherto entertained, to God be all the praise.

END OF THE WICKED—FIRST IMPRESSIONS.

It is now several years since, as I was crossing the ferry from Jersey city to New York, some one placed in my hands your first pamphlet on the final destruction of the wicked. I can hardly express to you the aversion, the loathing, with which I turned from it. I do not know what could, at that time, have been a sufficient inducement for me to enter upon the examination of such a subject, as one that might with any possibility be true. I regarded it in the light of something totally, eternally, and necessarily false, and in the highest degree pernicious. I should think it was eight or nine months afterwards, that for the first time in my life I met with an individual who avowed his belief in it, and urged it upon me as a truth. I revolted from it and kicked against it, as Saul of Tarsus did against the truth that Jesus of Nazareth was the true Messiah. I was at that time delivering a course of lectures on the coming of the Lord; and having been told that report in the place accused me of holding to the annihilation of the wicked, I had taken good care to shield my reputation from such a stain, by a public disavowal of belief in any such sentiment, and a strong asseveration of my full and firm adherence to the opposite opinion. The day after the subject had been presented, as I was riding, my thoughts were again turned to the subject. In connection with the coming of the Lord, I had been preaching holiness of heart and life as the indispensable preparation for such an event; telling the people that without a perfect readi-

ness in all things to do the will of Christ, without any reserve or stipulation, and that at the expense of any sacrifice or suffering, even to the laying down of life for the truth's sake, they could not be saved; as He had said, "He that saveth his life shall lose it." The thought now rushed upon my mind, would I be willing to preach the destruction of the wicked for Christ's sake, should I find it true? I shrank from answering the question more than I can express. I hoped that it was not true: I felt ashamed of such a sentiment, and most ardently desired that I might never be called to the extreme mortification of avowing my belief therein. A few scriptural facts, however, at that time were fastened upon my mind, which, together constituted an argument which I could not meet, and never has been met, to my knowledge; and I am fully persuaded never can be.

PROCESS OF CONVICTION.

They were the following:—1 Tim. 6: 16, "*Who only hath immortality*, dwelling in light which no man hath seen or can see."

I now saw that if God only hath immortality, it does not belong to man. It is of no use to say that man's body does not possess immortality, while his soul does, for it is expressly declared that none but the invisible God, "dwelling in light which no man hath seen or can see," hath immortality. It is therefore true only of God as a Spirit; and now to say that the spirit of man has immortality is to rob God of this perfection and give it to fallen man, whom God has declared is dust, and to dust must return. God did not say to man, thy body is dust and thy soul immortal. Dust *thou* art and unto dust shalt *thou* return. The current philosophy teaches that the body is not the man, but a mere appendage, and that when that is dropped the man is more alive and active than ever. According to this philosophy, it is not true that man is dust and to dust returns; for this notion ascribes to man an immortality in spirit, which the Bible declares to be possessed by none but the invisible God.

In 2d Tim. 1: 10, we are taught that "Our Saviour Jesus Christ hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." I was led to inquire at once, if immortality comes through the Gospel, how are those to gain it who reject the Gospel? This question was also to me unanswerable, and is equally so to all the world. In the 2d chapter of Romans we read that at the revelation of the righteous judgment of God, he will render eternal life to those who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honour, and *immortality*. Again I inquired, why should man, who is declared by the current philosophy to be immortal, be enjoined in the Scriptures to seek immortality by patient continuance in well doing, if he possess it already? All these Scriptures I found to be wholly irreconcileable to the common *notion* that man is immortal, and produced a strong conviction in my mind, that the philosophy which taught the immortality of all mankind might prove false. It is perfectly idle here to divide man into parts, and say that some part of man is mortal, and some immortal; for if part of man is immortal, it is not true that God only hath immortality.

Being entirely unwilling, however, to embrace so unpopular a doctrine, as that "all the wicked God will destroy," I rested upon the declarations that the wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, be tormented day and night for ever; and though at times I could not but admit that the destruction of the wicked might be true; yet so unwilling was I to embrace the sentiment, that I would go back again and rest on those same passages touching the duration of future punishment. In this state of mind I struggled onward, with many misgivings that I might be rejecting truth, because ashamed of it, until at Oberlin, last Fall, reasoning with them concerning the kingdom of God. To overthrow a position I had taken respecting the future inheritance of the saints in the earth, Pres. Mahan one evening went into a scriptural examination of the terms, ever, everlasting, eternal, for ever and ever. He showed clearly from the scriptures that these terms were sometimes applied to objects that must have an end,—as the everlasting mountains, the everlasting priesthood of the Jews, and the land of Idumea, whose smoke is to ascend for ever;—and thus clearly established the position, that these terms could only mean the entire duration of the object to which they are applied. When applied to God, these terms mean, as long as God exists. When applied to the righteous, as long as the righteous exist: to the mountains, or Jewish priesthood, while they exist: and of course, I said, when applied to the wicked, they mean as long as the wicked exist. I immediately told the audience that President Mahan had thrown light upon my mind, for he had fairly established the foregoing position from Scripture, and as an honest man I could not deny it. I now saw clearly that while the wicked exist, they will exist to suffer; but I was led at once to inquire how long will they exist? Have they any promise of immortality? or is there any thing in the Bible that proves them immortal? The terms everlasting, eternal, &c., applied to their punishment, do not prove them immortal, because these terms are applied to objects which do come to an end; and hence, notwithstanding these terms, the wicked may come to an end; and now I wish to ascertain from Scripture whether the wicked are to have an end.

If they are immortal, then these terms, when applied to their punishment, prove it endless; but if they are not immortal, then these terms prove that while they exist, they exist to suffer. Are they immortal? President Mahan had a very curious way of attempting to get out of the difficulty into which he had brought himself, by the position which he had fully established touching the meaning of these terms. He said, when applied to the endless future, they expressed endless duration; and hence, as the punishment of the wicked had reference to the endless future, these terms expressed endless duration when applied to the punishment of the wicked.

But the point was this; Does the punishment of the wicked have reference to the endless future? The terms everlasting, for ever and ever, eternal, &c., are applied to objects which have an end. Will the wicked have an end? But, says the President, these terms, when applied to the interminable future, mean endless duration. This is admitted; but I am wishing to know what these terms mean when applied to the wicked: some objects to which these terms are applied have an end—will the wicked have an end? I now saw clearly that if I could prove the wicked immortal by other Scriptures, then I could prove by the foregoing terms that their sufferings were interminable; but if they were not immortal, then their sufferings would run parallel with their existence until they should be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power.

HIS CONVERSION.

Thus President Mahan completely demolished the last prop on which I had been leaning, to support the immortality of the wicked; for I knew full well, that the Bible contained nothing which began to promise immortality to the wicked, if these terms everlasting and eternal applied to their punishment did not. On the contrary, we are told that, "Yet a little and the wicked shall not be, yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be; as the whirlwind passeth so is the wicked no more; the wicked are overthrown, and are not; they are utterly consumed with terrors; they shall utterly perish in their own corruption; when the wicked spring as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be destroyed for ever; they shall perish for ever as their own dung, they shall be chased away as a vision of the night; they shall be as though they had not been; the day that cometh shall burn them up, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch; thine hand shall find out all thine enemies, thy right hand shall find out those that hate thee; thou shalt make them as a fiery oven in the time of thine anger; the Lord shall swallow them up in his wrath, and the fire shall devour them; their fruit shalt thou destroy from the earth, and their seed from among the children of men." All these I have found to be plain Scriptural declarations.

Now, as the wicked have not immortality, as the terms everlasting and eternal applied to them, do not necessarily imply endless duration, unless their immortality can first be established by other proof, and as the Bible does positively declare in repeated instances they shall not be, and shall be no more, and shall be as though they had not been, the argument is conclusive. They will be destroyed for ever. He that does not see and admit this conclusion is where I have been touching this very subject—ashamed to see and fully to avow the truth.

Even after all this light was upon my mind, I had a severe struggle with myself before I could consent to become openly and fearlessly its advocate. I thought, or rather tried to think for a time, that it would be better to say nothing on the subject. But in that condition neither my own spirit nor the Spirit of God would give me any rest. I knew I had no right to be ashamed of God's truth any more than of Himself, and that while professing to bear witness to the truth, I could not draw back from testifying to the whole truth, through shame or the fear of man, without drawing back to perdition.

If such men as President Mahan can rest upon a mere quibble, a begging of the whole question, after admitting that these terms do not always imply endless duration, but claim that they do when applied to the wicked, because they do when applied to the interminable future, I must leave them with God. My Bible tells me that the wicked shall not be, and therefore the word everlasting, when applied to them, no more proves that they always will be, than it proves the same thing of other objects which have an end. Brother Miller also thinks that he has been preserved from great errors, by refusing to receive any thing for truth which has one plain text of Scripture against it. I admit the correctness of the principle, and therefore I cannot believe in the immortality of the wicked; for I am told that they shall be utterly consumed with terrors, and that they shall not be—and I know that there are very many plain texts which do plainly teach the same thing. For the same reason I cannot believe that the wicked are to be taken to the moon or to any other part of the universe to be punished: because the word of God plainly declares, "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, *much more the wicked and the sinner.*" They must therefore receive their recompense in the earth, and that recompense is to be, "burned

up, root and branch." These truths, through great trials and struggles, I was at length constrained by the fear of God to avow and defend. I cannot shrink from them without offending God, any more than our dear brethren can withhold truth on the coming of the Lord. I see Christ exalted to give life and immortality. I see man in the dust destitute of immortality, because of sin. This honors Christ and abases man. I must glorify Christ by presenting Him as the giver of life. I must abase man by showing him that he is dust, and then encourage him by pointing him to Christ for life. May the Lord guide us all into His blessed truth, and bring us quickly to His glorious kingdom. CHAS. FITCH.

SELECTED.

From the Truth-Seeker.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

The Editors of the Truth-Seeker have received the letter subjoined, on which they beg to offer a few observations, in correction of a mistake under which the writer seems to labor.

1. While this Magazine is free to all parties, the Editors stand identified with none. Each paper, whether poem, essay, or tale, must rest on its own merits, and not be affiliated upon *them*. The editors' duty is merely that of selection, with reference to literary worth, philosophic temper, intrinsic importance, and due variety of topic. Further than this, they disclaim all responsibility, and must not have their own individual (and on many points even diverse) opinions, confounded with those of their various contributors. Even the "reviews" are not written by one hand, and therefore do not express uniformity of opinion.

2. As their periodical, then, is an Organ of Thought, not a *stereotyping* apparatus, the editors admit into it various "theories," others as well as their own; and they invite all men to *test* them, freely and therefore fearlessly—since there can be no freedom of thought where the mind is in bondage to fear. *All*, consequently, are at full liberty to "dissent" from the theories propounded in these pages, and what alone is to the purpose, to state their reasons for dissenting.

3. In accordance with this plan, the objections of their correspondent have been placed before the Theological Reviewer—PATHFINDER—who is solely responsible for the "theory" in question. They leave him to defend his own doctrines, feeling sure that he is quite competent to the task. In conclusion, they would express their pleasure that the Truth-Seeker has already been the means of aiding their correspondent in his pursuit of truth "*on many points*," and they hope that it may yet be the means of doing so on many more. They heartily concur in the maxim of Sir William Drummond, that "he who *cannot* reason is a fool, he who *dares not* a coward, and he who *will not* a knave."

ETERNAL LIFE IN TORMENTS ADVOCATED.

"In common with yourselves, I profess to be desirous of knowing 'What is Truth' on *all* subjects, and your magazine has, on *many* points, aided my desire; nevertheless, I am free to confess my dissent from some of your theories, and amongst them, I beg to name that on Future Punishment. If I rightly understand your doctrine, you hold that the eternal punishment of the wicked consists in utter annihilation. I dissent from this doctrine, not, I trust, because education and priestly influence have prejudiced or blinded my mind, but solely because I cannot see its accordance with the Scriptures of Truth. Allow me, then, briefly to state my reasons for so thinking:

1. The wicked will not be punished by an everlasting *annihilation;* but will have an 'everlasting *punishment.*' (Matt. xxv. 46.)

2. By the *figurative* expression, 'death,' as applied to the state of the soul hereafter, is not meant 'the ceasing of the soul to exist,' any more than the phrase 'Dead in trespasses and sins,' means that the ungodly in this world have no souls.

3. If the wicked have no existence *hereafter*, how can *they* suffer 'weeping and gnashing of teeth,' (Matt. viii. 12,) 'the worm that dieth not,' and 'the fire that is not quenched?' (Mark ix. 46.)—What meaning is there in these figures, if they do not show that Hell is a '*place* of *torment*' (Luke xvi. 28,) as well as (the place) of 'the second *death*?'

4. How can ungodly men, if they cease to exist, '*dwell* with the devil and his angels?' (Matt. xxv. 41.)

5. If the phrase 'everlasting punishment' does not mean *never-ending* punishment, in the strictest sense of the term, how can we be sure that 'eternal *life*' is not also limited?

I might greatly *multiply reasons*, but I wish to remark, that 'he who spake as never man spake,' speaks more plainly on *this* subject than either prophets or apostles, and we should be very careful that we refuse not to hear his words. Take away the fear of punishment from the world, and how much would they value your arguments for virtue and heaven? Such doctrine appears so agreeable to our fallen nature, that I, for one, should be glad to believe it true, but cannot shut my eyes to the plain declarations of Scripture; and as I *suppose* such doctrine to be contrary to good morals, I am the more cautious in receiving the reasonings brought to support it. I believe there is much sense in a remark I recently heard, that 'a half-truth is often found to be a whole lie,' and I wish the friends of the doctrine I have been questioning, to look not only on the *pros*, but also on the *cons*. "O."

'EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION' DEFENDED.

"O," it appears, chiefly dissents from my "theories," on the ground of their non-accordance with the "Scriptures of Truth:" yet, if he will carefully re-peruse my article "Profit and Loss," in the first volume, and my review of "Spiritual Creation," in the present one—to which, I presume, he refers—he will find that I have the "plain declarations" of those same Scriptures to support what he deems my "half-truth and whole-lie" doctrine. This, at least, is a *presumption* in my favor, which ought to restrain the positiveness of my opponent. The doctrine I advocate, however, is no "theory" of *mine*. From youth up, I was inculcated with the prevalent dogma; and it was a cautious, critical, and I believe conscientious, examination of "the Scriptures of Truth," which in fact *compelled me* to abandon my priest-instilled errors, and embrace "the faith once delivered to the saints." I do not believe that "O" can adduce one jot or tittle, either

pro or *con*, which I have NOT carefully considered—at least I shall be surprised if he does. I am, if not egregiously mistaken, perfectly familiar with the temper of the arms and armor worn on *his* side, and yet have such a thorough conviction of their utter unsoundness, that I would just as readily break a score of lances with the Bench of Bishops, or the College of Cardinals, as with your solitary Vowel in a controversial tilt on this question. *Here*, if no where else, I am covered with a panoply of proof—I can put on "the whole armor of God," and "wield the sword of the spirit," which is the word of God. It is not *I* who refuse to hear the declarations of the great Christian Leader—(whose entire system of salvation is based upon the very views I advocate, and is *logically* ruined by rejecting them)—it is my opponent. Though I do not think that the Lord has, in truth, spoken more plainly on this subject, than prophets and apostles, since I cannot conceive of *plainer* language than some which they have employed—I still think that his language is *sufficiently* distinct. But *where* does He teach the doctrine expressed at the head of O's letter? He affirms that the finally wicked shall *perish, die*, be *consumed*, *burnt up* as chaff—in short, *lose themselves*, their life:—but *where* does he affirm that they shall be *burning* up for ever? He teaches that wicked men shall be *destroyed;* but where does he say that they are *indestructible?* He teaches that they shall *die*, but where does he assert that they shall *live for ever?* His apostles teach that the wicked shall *perish* in their own *corruption;* but where do they teach that the wicked are *incorruptible* and *imperishable*, and therefore unburnable and immortal? Of the HOLY, indeed, it is said, *they* shall 'live for ever;' but where do Christ and his ambassadors teach that the WICKED shall 'live for ever?'

But while the very title of O's letter is an *unscriptural* phrase, the title of my reply is the exact language of 'the Scriptures of Truth.' *Prima faciæ*, therefore, my doctrine is the most scriptural, since it can be expressed in scriptural words, *unequivocally*, which "O's" can not. It must have been, I suppose, some perception of this sort, which induced "O" to represent my doctrine by the phrase '*annihilation*,' rather than by the clear scriptural language which I prefer. This substitution of phrases is an old trick of the *pseudo* orthodox, which I always look upon with suspicion; at the same time I am quite willing to allow, that I *may* have misinterpreted the genuine scripture phrases, 'everlasting *death* and *destruction*,' and I am even ready to listen to reasons for reading it 'ever-lasting *life* in *torments!*'

(1.) The first reason offered by "O," however, contains two logical fallacies. It is a *petitio principii*, inasmuch as it begins by begging the thing to be proved (that the fate of the wicked is *not* annihilation;) and it is a *non sequitur*, inasmuch as it ends by drawing as a conclusion what does not follow (that annihilation is no punishment.)

Death—the mere killing of the body (for the soul—*the future life*—depends on God alone)—is commonly called, by way of emphasis, '*capital* punishment'—because it is the chief, the *head* punishment, which implies the *loss of all*—yet, according to "O," the very greatness of the punishment—'utter annihilation;' suddenly makes it NO punishment whatever! If *suffering* alone is 'punishment,' then the guillotine is a more trifling punishment than three months at the treadmill!* But what say 'the Scriptures of Truth,' to which "O" refers me.

Paul, Sylvanus, and Timothy, writing to the Church at Thessalonica, confidently appeal to the purity of their lives and morals: 'Ye know what manner of men we were among you, *imitators of the Lord.*' What was the consequence of their preaching and practice? The church, 'having embraced the word, *became examples to all that believe.*' They affirm that they 'were bold to speak the gospel of God, not of deceit, *nor of impurity*' (1 Thess. ch. 1: 2.) Yet hear that gospel concerning Future Punishment. It is what "O" 'SUPPOSES to be contrary to good morals!' Nevertheless, its *fruits* were such, that the apostles gloried in that church!

"It is a righteous thing with God, to recompense affliction to those that afflict you, * * * in flaming fire sending *punishment* on those who know not God, and who obey not the gospel, * * * who will suffer *punishment;*" well, and what is that punishment, twice so called? "*Even* EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION *from the presence of the Lord.*" (2 Thess. chap. 1.)

(2.) The second reason of "O" is just as illogical and assumptive as his first. I assert, by way of balance to *his* assertion, that by 'the expression, *death*, as applied (in Scripture) to the wicked hereafter,' *is* ALWAYS meant the ceasing of the soul to exist, and that, on such theme, it is *never once* applied 'figuratively.'

But I do not see, even assuming any truth in the assertion just negatived, what inference is deducible from the latter part of the reason, which at all affects my opinion. "O" seems to forget that right 'figures' are founded upon real 'facts.' Hence, so must be the figurative expression, 'dead in trespasses and sins.' But, is the occasional *figure* to be used for neutralizing the constant *literal phrase?* Is it the minor which must determine the sense of the major? the figure which must declare the force of the fact? Nay, it is just the reverse! We must rather make the few submit to the many, the less to the greater, and interpret the occasional by the constant; in brief, we must understand what we *can*, 'literally,' and only what we *must*, 'figuratively.'

Thus here, 'dead *in* sin,' just like its opposite 'dead unto sin,' or 'alive in Christ,' presupposes some physical states called 'dead' and 'alive,' to which the moral states are *likened*, or correspond. Now, what is the point of correspondence? Clearly, that as a dead body exists in a state of *corruption*, lifeless, moveless; so the *moral nature* of man, his kindness and his conscience, exists amidst the corruptions of sense. He is, morally, lifeless, helpless, and hopeless; in fact, *buried in sin.* Thus, 'dead unto sin, but alive unto righteousness,' (or in Christ,) signifies that as a dead body *cannot move* towards an object, has no consciousness of it, no desire for it, so is the spiritual and renewed man. He lives and moves unto righteousness, but is 'dead unto sin,' just as he who is 'dead *in* sin' is thereby 'dead *unto* righteousness.' Hence, these figures, when examined, only show that death (to the full extent it is predicated) invariably signifies LOSS; privation, not pain; separation *from* consciousness, not ceaseless suffering *in*

*I must insist that in my sermon on 'Profit and Loss,' it is clearly *demonstrated* that Pain is *not* the real punishment, but *Privation*. Now, all truth is harmonious, and hence Scripture, truly interpreted, will be found accordant with rigid philosophy and real fact.

it. Indeed, is it not a gross absurdity, a disgraceful piece of verbal legerdemain, to convert *perpetual death* into *prolonged life*, and a *merciful destruction* into *indestructible torture?** If such 'fantastic tricks' form part of the philosophy of language, then farewell to the philosophy of truth!

(5.) Where or when have I affirmed that the wicked will have 'no existence hereafter?' Christ and his apostles have assuredly declared that there *will* be a Resurrection and a Judgment (for, if not, as Paul says, they who *sleep* are PERISHED; and how could that have been said by a man who believed they were then *awake* and *happy* in heaven?) a resurrection to 'eternal *Life*,' as respects the good; but to tribulation, anguish, and 'the second death,' as regards the wicked. How long that world's assize will last—how long 'the white throne' will be fixed, before which the vast population of teeming centuries must pass in solemn review (if we accept the language as literal)—we know not. But that protracted period must be one of terror and despair to the sinner; the rebel against the kindest of kings and most considerate of parents; and amidst the 'weeping and wailing' of that woful time, it is no wonder if they call upon the very rocks and mountains to fall upon them! Still, as Paul says, 'the *end* of those things is DEATH: for the *wages* of sin is DEATH: but the *gift* of God is everlasting *life*.'

That death is terrible to all to whom life is valuable; most terrible therefore to the selfish sinner; it is 'even *everlasting destruction* FROM THE PRESENCE OF THE LORD.' Now, let "O" reflect a moment on the full force of this most explicit passage. Whither shall we fly from the presence of the Lord, or of his spirit? Wherever there is creation, be it in heaven, earth, or hell, *there* is God's presence, power, and glory. Every 'damned spirit,' supposing such things to exist, must *literally* 'live, and move, and have its being' in the Lord. How, then, *can* a LIVING spirit be '*punished with everlasting destruction from His presence*?' Yet that is the distinct testimony of Scripture; and our choice rests therefore between Paul's doctrine of *destruction* and the theory of 'tortured spirits' living in a place called Hell. I must candidly tell "O" [whether priestly influence has blinded his eyes, or not,] that this doctrine of his is entirely a fiction and forgery of priests, palmed upon the ignorance; besotted and *wilful* [and therefore criminal] ignorance of their idolizers; and that it is not more opposed to the analogy of nature and the results of sound reason, than to the reiterated and 'plain declarations of Scripture.'

[To be continued.]

When the venerable Dr. Watts was very feeble and near his end, he said to his attendant, I remember an aged minister used to say that the most learned and knowing Christians, when they came to die, have only the same plain promises of the gospel for their support, as the common and unlearned, and so I find it. They are the plain promises of the gospel which are my support, and I bless God they are plain promises, which do not require much labour or pains to understand them.

* By the way, "O" would oblige by informing me, whether, in his opinion, the expulsion from Eden was an act of Mercy or of Vengeance? In short, *why* the sinning pair were put forth?

THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

But it will be replied, the Scriptures are difficult to be understood, and therefore require the explanations of the Fathers. It is true, there be some books, and especially some places in those books, that remain clouded; yet ever that which is most needed to be known is most easy; and that which is most difficult, so far expounds itself ever, as to tell us how little it imports our saving knowledge. Hence, to infer a general obscurity all over the text, is a mere suggestion of the Devil to dissuade men from reading it, and casts an aspersion of dishonour upon the mercy, truth, and wisdom of God. The very essence of truth is plainness and brightness; the darkness and crookedness is our own. The wisdom of God created understanding, fit and proportionable to truth, the object and end of it, as the eye to the thing visible. If our understanding have a film of ignorance over it, or be blear with gazing on other false glistenings, what is that to truth? If we will but purge with sovereign eye-salve that intellectual ray which God hath planted in us, then we would believe the Scriptures, protesting their own plainness and perspicuity, calling to them to be instructed not only the wise and the learned, but the simple, the poor, the babes; foretelling an extraordinary effusion of God's spirit upon every age and sex, attributing to all men, and requiring from them, the ability of searching, trying, examining all things, and by the Spirit discerning that which is good; and as the Scriptures themselves pronounce their own plainness, so do the Fathers testify of them.—*Milton, in* 1641.

☞ THE EDITOR of this paper preaches every Lord's day at COMMISSIONERS HALL, Third street, below Green, east side; at 10½ A. M., and in the evening at 7 o'clock.

THE "SIX SERMONS" on the End of the Wicked, &c., can be had at No. 21 North Sixth Street, or of the Author, 18 Chester Street, between Race and Vine, 8th and 9th. Price, in Pamphlet, 15 cents, or ten copies for $1.00. The pamphlet includes the views of the author on the question, "Have the dead knowledge?" The Sermons advocate the doctrine, that "All the wicked will God *destroy*, or, cause them to cease from life, after the judgment.

☞ TERMS OF THE EXAMINER. — All persons who pay 5 per year to the support of this paper will be entitled to *thirteen* copies of each monthly number, to be sent to their order, to themselves or any other persons whose names they may furnish. For $3 *eight* copies will be sent in like manner; and for $2 *five* copies. Single subscribers 50 cents for twelve monthly numbers; or, for one year. Payment always in advance, and free of postage to us.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY, 1848. No. 2.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 21 N. SIXTH STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

☞ FOR TERMS, See last page.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—NO. III.

BY J. T. WALSH.

Having spoken of the *territory* of the kingdom, and of the *dominion* and *advent* of the king, we shall return, and bring up another branch of this subject.

THE SURE MERCIES OF DAVID.

Abraham begat Isaac, Isaac begat Jacob, and of him it is thus spoken: "Out of Jacob shall come he that shall have *dominion*, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city." Numbers 24: 19. Jacob, a short time previous to his death, while pronouncing certain blessings upon his children, speaks thus of *Judah*, from whom Christ descended: "Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise; thy hand shall be on the neck of thy enemies, thy father's children shall bow down to thee. Judah is a lion's whelp; from the prey, my son, thou hast gone up: he stooped down, he crouched as a lion: who shall rouse him up? The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and to him shall be the gathering of the people." Gen. 49: 9, 10.

The above is evidently a prediction concerning the Messiah, who is, indeed, "the Lion of the tribe of Judah." It relates not only to his first advent, but, also, to the time when he shall "reign over the house of Israel forever;" at which time his "brethren shall praise him," and "bow down to" him

The Lord said to David, "And when thy days shall be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy *seed* after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will *establish the throne of his kingdom forever*. I will be his father, and he shall be my son If he shall commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men: But my mercy shall not depart from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established forever before thee: *thy throne shall be established forever*." 2 Sam. 7: 12—16.

Some commentators suppose the above paragraph refers to Solomon exclusively. But it must be obvious to the most casual observer, that this quotation looks farther than the *days* of Solomon. Solomon was a very striking *type* of the Messiah, in more aspects than one. Of Solomon it is said, "And Solomon reigned over all kingdoms, from the river to the land of the Philistines, and to the border of Egypt: they brought presents and served him all the days of his life. For he had dominion over all the region on this side the river, from Ziphsah even unto Azzah, over all the kings on this side the river: and he had peace on all sides around him." 1 Kings, 4: 20—24.

Let the reader remember, that Solomon was the *first* king that reigned *peaceably* over *all the territory* promised to Abraham and his *seed*; and he will see at once, that, in this particular, he was a type of the Messiah's reign, or kingdom over the *same* territory. And, inasmuch as Solomon was a type of the Lord Jesus in his kingly character, what is said of David's *seed*, and of his *throne* and *kingdom*, in the quotation already made, must be understood as applying to Solomon in so far as he is the type of Messiah. Hence he promises to "be a father to him," and claims him as "his son," in a peculiar sense. Also, he promises "*to establish his throne and kingdom forever*." And, as if to fix the meaning of the passage in its application to the Messiah, as well as to show the meaning David himself attached to it, David says: "*Thou hast spoken, also, of thy servant's house for a great while to come;*" thus showing conclusively that he did not apply it to Solomon, nor to the time then present.

Now let us turn to the last words of David, 2 Sam. 23: 1—5, "Now these are the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man who was raised on high, the annointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said—The Spirit of the Lord spoke by me, and his word was on my tongue. The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spoke to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God. And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain. Although my house is not so with God, yet he hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure: for this is all my salvation, and all my desire, although he maketh it not to grow."

This is one of the most interesting passages in the whole book, and the reader will excuse us for dwelling somewhat largely upon it.

Let us remember that David is here speaking "by the Spirit," and that these are his "*last words*." When he says, "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God," he is doubtless speaking of the Messiah, for he immediately proceeds to describe him. "*And he shall be as the light of the morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds; as the tender grass springing out of the earth by clear shining after rain.*" This refers to the time when he shall appear the "second time without a sin offering, in order to salvation." Then, as "the bright and morning star,"—"the

sun of righteousness,"—"the day star," he will dispel all darkness, "rend the veil away, that blinds the nations now;" and "fill the earth with the glory and knowledge of God."

David then proceeds: "*Although my house is not so with God;* YET HE HATH MADE WITH ME AN EVERLASTING COVENANT, ORDERED IN ALL THINGS, AND SURE, *for this is all my salvation, and all my desire,* ALTHOUGH HE MAKETH IT NOT TO GROW."

Here David confesses that "his house," at that time, "was not *so* with God;" that present appearances were against the realization of his hope; "YET," says he, "God hath made with me an everlasting covenant," "ordered in all things and sure;" and this "everlasting covenant," "ordered and sure," in all its provisions, was "all his salvation," and "all his desire; although," for the time then present, "he made it not to grow." Now turn to the 89th Psalm, and read the following: "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn to David my servant, *thy* SEED *will I establish forever, and build up* THY THRONE *to all generations.*"

Reader, these are "the sure mercies of David!" His "*seed*," the Messiah, will Jehovah "*establish forever.*" He will "build up his throne"—the throne of his kingdom "to all generations."

Again, in verse 19th we read: "Then thou didst speak in vision to thy holy one, and say, I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people. I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I annointed him: with whom my hand shall be established: my arm also shall strengthen him. The enemy shall not exact upon him: nor the son of wickedness afflict him. And I will beat down his foes before his face, and afflict them that hate him. But my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him: and in my name shall his *horn* be exalted. I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry to me, Thou art my father, my God, the rock of my salvation. ALSO I WILL MAKE HIM MY FIRST BORN, HIGHER THAN THE KINGS OF THE EARTH. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. *His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the days of heaven.*" Again, at the 35th verse, "*Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie to David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.*" Again, he adds, "*But thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast been wroth with thy anointed.* Thou hast made void the covenant of thy servant; *thou hast profaned his crown by casting it to the ground.*"

Here we have the perpetuity of David's throne and kingdom, fully and explicitly explained to us. And we also have the *fact* that his throne should be *vacant*, clearly indicated. And this harmonizes with the prophet: "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is *fallen*, and close up their breaches; and I will raise up its ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old." Amos 9: 11.

ZEDEKIAH was the last king that sat on David's throne; since that time "his crown has been cast to the ground," and "his tabernacle *fallen* down." But the time is approaching when "his tabernacle will be raised up," his throne erected, his kingdom organized, and his *son* will reign thereon "*forever*!"

[To be continued.]

POLYTHEISM NOT PECULIAR TO PAGANS;

OR, WITCHCRAFT UNVEILED.

No. II.

Here is the witch, and her dupe, Saul, who was a head taller than any other man in Israel, and was unquestionably identified by the witch at first sight. The predictions, adverse to his well-being, were too notorious to be a secret to a person of her character and practices. Saul's recent violence against her fraternity of witches must have operated to arouse her resentment, and provoke her to vengeance. And his immediate acknowledgement of her power, on his first introduction, would arm her with boldness, and increase her confidence in her ability at deception. Immediately, therefore, on hearing Saul's request—"I *pray* thee," (beseechingly) "divine unto me by the familiar spirit, and bring me *him* up, whom I shall name unto thee;" without asking or learning the name she should call, "the woman said unto him, Behold, thou knowest what Saul hath done, how he hath cut off those that have familiar spirits, and the wizards out of the land; wherefore, then, layest thou a snare for my life, to cause me to die?" As a matter of course, such a speech, she knew very well, would take Saul by surprise—give him to understand that she was ignorant of his person, and facilitate her project of duping him. The bait was caught eagerly—"And Saul sware unto her by the LORD, saying, As the LORD liveth, there shall no punishment happen to thee for this thing." This declaration, if there had been any doubt on the witch's mind, of the identity of the *person* before her, must, notwithstanding Saul's disguise, have dissipated it. "Then, said the woman, whom shall I bring up unto thee?" "And he said, Bring me up Samuel." There can be no doubt about the woman's previous knowledge of a man so conspicuous in Israel as had been this prophet.

At this stage of the proceedings, let us consider, that it does not appear that Saul's attendants were present; neither is it likely that the woman would have consented to witnesses being at the interview. And, *it being night*, the woman had full opportunity to avail herself of as much obscurity as she chose; and, as was customary with all ancient impostors, she undoubtedly took her position, and stationed her dupe, so that attending circumstances should aid her deception. She probably occupied a *recess*, fitted to such occasions, and was also screened by some contrivance or other from the gaze of Saul, if the dim light admitted should enable him to distinguish objects. Thus prepared, and Saul, standing at a proper distance, trembling with fear, and his mind distracted with conflicting emotions, which would necessarily operate to disqualify him from any accurate observation, *she opens the scene*—SHE CRIES WITH A LOUD VOICE—*and* a frightful scream, as of a person in peril, or terror, first saluted the ears of the now truly terrified king of Israel.

The phrase, "And when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice," is merely *imagery*, intended to convey an idea of the mode of practising the deception. For, as a matter of course, a cause existed for the woman's exclamation—and the cause is merely placed in order before the effect—she was to raise the spirit of Samuel, and she announced the success of her incantation by a frightful scream. Now the cunning of the impostor is seen. As if the spirit she had raised, had inform-

ed her, she says to Saul, "Why hast thou deceived me? for thou art Saul." This naturally causes Saul's mind to revert to what occurred at the commencement of the interview, and induces him, as she expected, to reassure her of her safety. Saul, you will remember, *has seen nothing*—he has been electrified by the woman's terrific outcry, and thereby more fully prepared to swallow her deceptions. "And the king said unto her, Be not afraid: for what sawest thou?" The answer of the witch is admirable. She is desirous of heightening the wonder of her dupe—she assumes the power of commanding the supposed infernal deities, by her answer. "I saw Gods (in the *plural*) ascending out of the earth." Saul's immediate reply shows the confusion of his mind, and his first idea as being uppermost. He therefore asks, "What form is HE of?" Imagine the condition of the parties, at the present moment. SAUL HAS SEEN NOTHING. The woman commenced the farce, very probably, by burning incense, or some fumigating gum, in a pan of coals; and, ensconced in a recess, a smoke between her and Saul, she first announced the effect of her incantation by a terrific *scream*. Saul is now full of agonizing expectation. And Saul instead of shaping his question, as it would be reasonable to expect, in conformity to the information conveyed to him by the woman, that she "saw Gods ascending out of the earth," inquires of the woman respecting the *form* of the spirit, as though ONE, only had been raised. There is a very singular discrepancy in the phraseology of the translators, who make the woman, in the first instance, to cry out, "*when she saw Samuel.*" Now the real fact is, that nothing is said of *seeing Samuel*, either by the woman herself, or by Saul, during this part of the farce. But, instead of this, the woman, immediately after she had given Saul to understand, that she had discovered who he was, by means of her incantations, instead of saying that she had seen Samuel, affirms, positively, in reply to Saul's interrogation, on hearing her outcry, "What sawest thou?" that she saw "Gods," in the plural, "ascending out of the earth." And, immediately on hearing Saul's second interrogatory, "What form is *he* of?" she gives a new shape to her farce. How absurd, therefore, has been the conjecture of those commentators, who have fancied that the Witch actually raised the spirit of Samuel, which they very *reasonably* conclude the Witch had *no idea of seeing*, she was so terrified as to cry aloud

The next scene in the farce of the witch, is quite in character. As she must have had a previous knowledge of Samuel, etc., as I have already mentioned, she was fully prepared for Saul's question—"What form is *he* of?" and she answers *instanter*, "An old man cometh up; and he is covered with a a mantle." The old woman, of course, was too modest to coerce the spirit of Samuel to appear at her biddding, without bestowing on him a decent covering. And as she had, very likely, seen Samuel, frequently, during his lifetime, she very charitably lends him HIS OLD CLOTHES TO WEAR ON THAT OCCASION. As soon as Saul learns the form of the spirit *from the Witch*, who, in conformity to his request to call up Samuel, informs Saul that an old man covered with a mantle, was the appearance or form of the Spirit; the account goes on, and says, "And Saul *perceived* that it *was* Samuel, and he stooped with his face to the ground, and bowed himself." Notwithsanding this mode of expression, SAUL SAW NOTHING; unless the witch exposed her *own* person to be partially observed by Saul, through the gloom and smoke that enveloped her. This might have been the case—and the attitude and dress assumed by her at that moment, and, dimly exposed, with the aid of Saul's diseased imagination, would have passed for a dozen different things. However this may have been, the term *perceived* does not necessarily import further than this, that Saul, under the circumstances of the case, on hearing from the witch a description of the appearance of the spirit, came to the conclusion, that it was, in reality, the spirit of the dead prophet. It would be absurd to suppose that Saul *saw* the form of any thing, with his own eyes, in a manner sufficiently clear to satisfy himself of the appearance of the spirit in any shape.—(If Saul *saw*, with his own eyes, that it was Samuel, why ask the witch, "What *form* is he of?" J. T. W.) The dupe, being thus prepared, half crazed with apprehension of the result of the expected battle, his imagination ripened to the verge of bursting, with expectation of wonders from the witch's incantations, and bowed to the earth in an humble acknowledgement of his own inferiority, compared with the messenger of heaven, before whom he believed he stood, and from whom he would learn his doom, was admirably fitted to be duped even by a more clumsy, and a less experienced impostor than the Witch of Endor.

The phraseology of Samuel in addressing Saul, is very consistent and proper, on the supposition that the witch *personated* the spirit of the prophet; and is, as I shall show, precisely what should be expected under the circumstances of the parties; but very improbable indeed, on the supposition that a *real spirit*, and the spirit of the departed prophet, Samuel, actually appeared on that occasion, *by the agency of* JEHOVAH, to denounce to Saul his approaching doom. In the first case, as I shall contend, the whole operation being a sheer deception on the part of the woman, assisted very greatly by the superstition and alarm of Saul, the real facts, as they appear, are necessary, as constituting the imagery or parts of the deception, and are not a whit superior, when correctly understood, *to the usual mummery of experienced and adroit impostors.*

There is a fact connected with this woman's manœuvres, which goes to prove both her courage and her abilities, as a shrewd, cunning, and experienced impostor. We learn most explicitly from the connexion, and from the woman's declaration to Saul, that Saul had put away, or, as the woman's phrase expresses it, *cut off* those that have familiar spirits out of the land. No doubt, in one of Saul's freaks, he had made, as he thought, a thorough crusade against witches and wizards; perhaps, as an offset to some of his impious refusals to obey the commands of Jehovah. And this woman, in defiance of Saul's authority, and in despite of all his attempts to destroy her, had maintained her ground. And it also appears, that she openly practised her forbidden sorceries; and, as a consequence, possessed a corresponding notoriety; for, as it were, *instanter*, on Saul's expressing a desire to consult a woman having a familiar spirit, he was told where one was located. What was necessary in this case on the part of the woman? To *personate* Samuel, in a way that should deceive Saul. And as the woman had an opportunity unsought by her, to avenge herself, her enemy, who had sought her life, being present, she availed herself of Saul's alarm and fear

to increase it, by denouncing against him his certain and approaching ruin. From her trade, she must have been acquainted with human weakness, and human folly; and was unquestionably qualified from her experience, and her previous knowledge of Saul, and of the predictions of certain ruin, made by the prophet, of Saul, and of the kingdom being given to David, to arrange her plan of operation immediately on Saul's application to her. He came to the witch a trembling supplicant. Malice and imposture combined, and all in the head and heart of a cunning, bold woman, on the one hand—on the other, a man rendered almost frantic by fear, his imagination disturbed by portentous forebodings, and a superstition of the most abject kind, stood before a witch *begging* her assistance.

J. T. WALSH.

(To be continued.)

"ANNIHILATON"—LA ROY SUNDERLAND.

An article, headed "Annihilation," has appeared in the Advent Herald, signed La Roy Sunderland, and dated Boston, Nov. 9th, 1847. We propose to offer a few reflections on the "cursory thoughts" of this gentleman. And

1st, He proposes "to show," "that what has been written" in the columns of the Advent Herald, and "other Advent papers, has proved nothing—just nothing—in favour of annihilation."

Now, as we do not know what has been written in the Advent Herald, on this subject, we shall not say what has, or has not, been proved; but, so far as our views, on the subject of "annihilation" extend, we would merely observe that "annihilation," in its philosophical sense, is not taught in the scriptures. And, that, so far as my knowledge extends, no advocate of the "destruction of the wicked," has contended for any such view of the subject.

All honest inquirers after truth, should be satisfied with what the Scriptures teach, and not seek to impose a philosophical *sense* upon the *words* of Scripture. Suffice it, then, for us to say, that "annihilation," in its philosophical sense, is not taught in *nature* or *Revelation;* but the doctrine of DESTRUCTION *—absolute and unqualified destruction—*IS TAUGHT IN BOTH! Mr. Sunderland's labour is all lost, in this part of his argument. For the purpose of drawing the line of distinction still more plainly between the words "annihilation" and "destruction," we would remark, that "annihilation" signifies to reduce that which is *something* to *nothing*. It signifies to reduce an *entity* to a *nonentity*. This is its philosophical sense. The word "*destruction*" means to *unbuild*—to *disorganize* that which is organized—to reduce to its original elements. Hence whatever is "*annihilated*" is, *necessarily, destroyed*; but a thing, or person, may be *destroyed* without being "*annihilated.*"

Mr. Sunderland says: "Most of the articles I have seen on the subject, are exceedingly unsatisfactory, because they do not *define* either the thing, *substance*, to be annihilated, nor do they show the existence of any laws by which its annihilation is to be brought about." Discarding the word and idea of "*annihilation,*" with which Mr. Sunderland's mind seems to be filled, we would observe, THAT WICKED CORRUPTIBLE MEN will be the *subjects* of that "*destruction*" of which the Scriptures speak. The "*thing, substance,*" then, to be destroyed will be nothing more than a class of *mortal, corruptible men*, corruptible in soul, body, and spirit; and, surely, Mr. Sunderland has not to learn by what "LAWS" *corruptible men* can be destroyed! But, apart from any "law of nature" in the case, the *revealed laws of God* are sufficient to establish the point before us. The wicked, corruptible and mortal as they will be, are to be destroyed by, and in accordance with, the "*laws*" of God, as set forth in that divine code, the Bible. This Holy Book is full of "LAW" on the subject, but we will only refer to one at this time, viz: "*He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap* CORRUPTION." So that, as Mr. S. says, "God works by laws;" but he does not always work by *natural laws*. Christ did not die for sin according to *natural law;* but "according to the pre-determination of God." And sinners are not saved from sin, nor from eternal destruction, by obeying the natural laws: but by obeying the *revealed* LAWS of God. The saints will be saved eternally upon the same principle; and the wicked will be "*consumed*" for disobedience to the same laws, and thus *suffer the penalty affixed to them*, viz: DEATH, *the second death*.

Mr. S. says: "we have no definite ideas as to first principles," "with regard to matter and spirit." We are sorry *he* has not; for we are perfectly satisfied, that if Mr. S. did possess correct "definite ideas," "with regard to matter and spirit," he would cease to oppose the "destruction" of the wicked, upon the flimsy hypothesis, that it does not accord with the *natural* "*laws.*" Again, Mr. Sunderland says, "All results must correspond with the cause, or causes which have produced them; as there cannot be any result, or effect, without adequate cause." This is true: and there is an "adequate cause," in relation to the destruction of the wicked. That "*cause*" is sin—a violation of *revealed law;* and, hence, God says the "wages of sin is death;" and "the soul that sins, shall die." God, himself, is the *executioner*, for "all the wicked will *God* destroy;" and his agents, or instruments, are the material elements, which acting upon the bodies of the wicked, will produce death, disorganization, destruction. The *eating* of the forbidden fruit was an "adequate" cause of death, and all the ills growing out of a *mortal* existence; and will any man undertake to say, that *disobedience* to the laws of Jehovah is not an "adequate cause" of the final result, which is *eternal death*, a death from which there is no redemption?

All that Mr. Sunderland says, in his second paragraph, about "matter and mind in motion," "heat, motion, light, forms," &c. &c., are as far from the philosophy of the subject, as they are from the *mind* of the Holy Spirit, presented to us in the word of God. *His* ideas of "*eternal progression,*" in relation to the "Mineral, Vegetable, and Animal kingdoms," are as visionary, as transcendental, as the Arabian Nights Entertainments. For one, we say, God forbid the "eternal progression" of the animal kingdom! "Mind is" *not* "the perfection of the three preceding," kingdoms, mineral, vegetable, and animal, as Mr. S. affirms. *Mind* is the result of *organization.* We now speak of the *mind* of *man.* It is not true, as Mr. S would have us believe, that "mind is the perfection of the three preceding kingdoms, so that they become *individualized* into a conscious, intelligent spirit, *corresponding in its elements with the elements in the essence of the first producing cause,*" WHICH IS GOD HIMSELF. We say, this is not true; for, first, as we have already stated, mind is not the perfection of the Mineral, Vegetable and Animal king-

doms: and, secondly, Mr. S. *does not know* "THE ELEMENTS OF THE ESSENCE OF THE FIRST PRODUCING CAUSE;" and, consequently, cannot determine whether "the elements" of the mind of man, "correspond with the elements of the essence of the first producing cause!" From the preceding, the reader may judge upon what a shallow hypothesis Mr. Sunderland "infers this *progressive, unending existence of the human spirit!*" Again, Mr. S. says, "The laws by which Spirit is *developed* and *individualized*, are eternal, and, consequently, as long as those laws exist, spirit must exist. "The *laws*" by which the human mind is "*developed*," are *organic laws;* and are these "eternal" in relation to *mortal man?* Dissolve the organization, and where is the mind? The fact is, Mr. Sunderland has become entangled in the meshes of a vain philosophy—a philosophy, falsely so called; and nothing but a careful study of God's word can extricate him from the difficulty.

Mr. S. says again, "And yet persons who believe in the Divine Essence, tell us that *spirits* are to be annihilated!" We repudiate the use of such terms as "divine essence," and the "annihilation of *spirits*." They are not in the Book, and form no part of our Theology. Again, he says, "But God works by laws; and his laws are universal, invariable, and eternal." *Good!—The Revealed laws of God* are "invariable, and eternal," and, consequently, the "*end*" of some is "destruction,"—a death ending in death; because they violate his "invariable" and "eternal laws." "God only hath" inherent "immortality."—He is the source—the fountain of it; and he will bestow it upon none but the obedient. "The wages of sin is *death;* but the *gift of God is eternal life*, THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD." J. T. W.

PHRENOLOGY.

MR. FOWLER—SPIRITUALISM.

Having been a believer in the philosophy of phrenological science for many years, as well as a constant reader of the American Phrenological Journal, we have seen much in that work to admire; and it is with no little regret that we feel called upon by TRUTH to oppose anything coming from Mr. Fowler's racy pen. But the position Mr. F. occupies, as well as the influence he wields in the phrenological world, demands that, however much we may respect him, we should oppose what we believe to be at war with the philosophy of mind and the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. We have read, time and again, articles on marvellousness, or what Mr. F. calls "spirituality," from the pen of this gentleman, and lamented that he did not understand the subject before him; but an article in the December number of his journal, determined our mind, and we resolved at once to make an effort to set him right on the subject indicated. And we now proceed to redeem the pledge.

1. Let us first examine Mr. Fowler's definition of *marvellousness*. Here it is: "*Intuition; Faith; Prescience; spiritual perception of Truth, what is best, what is about to transpire; the "inner light;" perception and feeling of the spiritual; credulity; belief in the superhuman; and trust in divine guidings.*"

Here, then, we have Mr. Fowler's definition of the organ, or rather function of marvellousness, as large as life. But by what means he gets at the "intuition," or the "prescience" of this organ, we are not informed. He makes it an *intellectual* organ, and endows it with "spiritual *perception!*" He says, it sees "what is best," and perceives "what is about to transpire." He calls it the "inner light," and says it gives the "perception and feeling of the spiritual." All this will do very well for *assertion*, but where is the proof? This, Mr. F. has failed to give us. We are perfectly satisfied that *Faith*, and FAITH only, is the legitimate *function* of marvellousness; and that all the wild and extravagant things ascribed to it by Mr. Fowler, are palpable *abuses* of it, and have no more foundation in truth than the vagaries of Swedenborg. Marvellousness does not belong to the intellectual department of the brain, much less is it a *perceptive* faculty. It gives the power—the tendency—the disposition to believe, but does not foresee, nor predict, future events. It is *sentimental* in its character, and acts in harmony with the moral and intellectual powers. Man can *rationally* believe nothing without evidence. Where testimony begins, faith begins; and where testimony ends, faith ends. And where testimony and faith terminate, SUPERSTITION, with all its wild, unintelligible foolery, begins. The following is the order of its development: 1st, Credulity; 2d, Faith; 3d, Superstition; the latter of which is an abuse of marvelousness.

"Large spirituality," says Mr. F., "*perceives* and *knows things* INDEPENDENTLY *of the* SENSES *or intellectual faculties.*" Mr. F. has here left all philosophy, common sense, reason and revelation, far behind, toiling after him in vain! "*Perceives* and KNOWS things *independently* of the *senses?*" Independently of the "intellectual faculties?" Mr. Fowler's marvellousness is by far too large. This declaration savors more of superstition than of sound philosophy. Could the deaf and dumb have *correct* "*perceptions*" and "knowledge" of things "spiritual," "independently of the senses, or intellectual faculties?" Let the thousand and one *mutes*, that have been taught *how* to "perceive" and to "know," by means of the "senses" and "intellectual faculties," reply!

But, Mr. Fowler continues: "Small spirituality—*believes only on actual evidence.*" To be sure it does; and may we not add, *that marvellousness, legitimately exercised, never does believe* except upon "actual evidence?" God save me from the testimony of the man, who can believe *without* evidence!

But, Mr. Fowler did not learn all these wild notions from phrenology, for they are not in it, and, consequently, could not come out of it. His mind has been corrupted by popular theology! Hence, he says, "That man is endowed with an *immaterial principle*—an *undying soul*—which *sees* and *knows* by intuition, irrespective of material eyes or reason, is to many an experimental reality—a conscious *fact*"! Again, he says, "But for it (spirituality) the idea of God as a spirit, *of the immortality of the soul*, or of an *immaterial, disembodied spirit*, would have been absolutely impossible"!

Now, we ask Mr. Fowler, if *his* phrenology teaches the pagan notion of the "immortality of the soul!" Does it teach the doctrine of "an immaterial, disembodied spirit," or of an "undying soul?" If so, *his* phrenology is not our phrenology! Now, we affirm, and challenge Mr. Fowler to the proof, that these notions, which he has set forth as the teachings of phrenology, are not taught by the

science. They are the relics of Pagan philosophy. They are Platonic, and not Christian! Phrenology scouts them; and Revelation repudiates them!! Upon this subject Mr. Fowler is behind the age. He has suffered his overgrown marvellousness to lead him far beyond the confines of philosophy and common sense, and is lost amid the smoke and dust of the crumbling temple of pagan theology!

Phrenology teaches that the brain is the organ of the mind. Mind is developed through it; and when the brain is disorganized and resolved into dust, the mind is no more. That which is "immaterial" is nothing—it is a nonentity. And to affirm "immortality" of that which is "immaterial," is to affirm it of nothing! Mr. Fowler's "undying soul," the Bible affirms, "shall die;" for "the *soul* that sinneth it shall die." And as for his "disembodied spirits," ten thousand of them might dance on the point of a needle, without being at all incommoded!

This making a *religious system* of Phrenology, my soul abhorreth. Phrenology is the only true science of the mind; but Mr. Fowler has made too much of it. It is *so* good, as absolutely to be good for nothing! Medicine, politics, religion, and everything else, must be made to bow before it! The Bible itself has been sacrificed at its shrine, as in the case before us, and many others we could mention.

At some future time we may go a little more into this subject. We only intended, on the present occasion, to give a check to the erratic imagination of friend Fowler. And we hope he will give it a careful perusal. We may have been severe; but we mean well, and hope Mr. F. will receive it accordingly.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

J. T. W.

PHILOSOPHY OF MAN.—NO. II.

By J. T. Walsh.

What Man lost by the Fall.

What, we ask, did man lose by Adam's sin? Did he lose immortality? No; for Adam had it not, but was himself a candidate for it. Did he lose life eternal? No; for Adam was not in possession of this. What then did he lose? We answer, most emphatically, he lost life. All that Adam lost the title to, viz.: immortality and eternal life, by transgression or disobedience, Adam himself and his posterity gain a title to, and finally get possession of, by obedience through Christ. Some have ignorantly supposed that Adam's sin exposed him to temporal and spiritual death, and to eternal torments. His transgression never did, and never could expose him to eternal torments in hell. For if it had thus exposed him, it would have rendered all his posterity obnoxious to the same punishment. Would God punish men, and infants too, eternally in hell torments, for an act which they never committed, over which they had no control, and in which they had no part or lot? It is a libel on the character of God. Infidelity, yea, Atheism itself, is more consistent than this diabolical representation of the great Jehovah. Man then lost his right and title to life by Adam; he lost his life, his very being, and nothing more. And all this is gained by the "second Adam," the "Lord from heaven." And, now, his life, his being, can only be lost by his own disobedience in rejecting the Lord Jesus, who is our tree of life, who is the resurrection and the life eternal. "Blessed are they who do his commandments, that they (but not others) may have a right (a title) to the tree of life." What, now, we ask, becomes of the doctrine of total depravity, and consequent infant damnation? It is not here—no place can be found for it—it has a name, but no habitation! "But," says one, "do not our children come into the world without the knowledge of God, and is not this total depravity?" We answer, our's necessarily come into the world without the knowledge of God, and if children had been born to Adam, before he fell, they, too, would necessarily have been without this knowledge until taught, and, therefore, in this sense equally depraved. "But," says another, "have we not inherited all of our diseases, physical, moral and mental, from Adam and Eve?" We give an unequivocal No! For, Adam's constitution knew nothing at all of the thousand and one diseases with which humanity is now afflicted. Whence, then, have they, and do they come? We answer, they have been superinduced by an habitual and perpetual violation of the organic and physiological laws of our nature—laws which Adam never violated. God never intended that man should drag out a miserable existence here, but that he should live to a good old age, be happy while he lived, and finally wear out and drop into the grave, covered with honor and filled with peace. Those persons who charge all the ills, afflictions, &c., around us to the first sin, charge God with folly. "Why so?" Because the penalty of that law was death, one death, and not one thousand, which hundreds and thousands of our race suffer before they actually die. Many a fond mother has charged her own sins and misdeeds upon God, when she has had to follow a beloved child to the charnel house of the dead; when, if the truth was known and told, she, and she alone, is the guilty one. In fact, we have no reason to believe that God ever intended that an infant should die while such! O! the folly—the madness—the insanity of mortals! When? O! when will they learn wisdom? To sustain the doctrine of the Universalist, it would be necessary to prove that all men are condemned to the pains of hell forever on account of Adam's sin. But, when we view the whole matter in its true light, and see man, who was condemned to death in Adam, adjudicated to life by obedience through our Lord Jesus Christ, we have no difficulty in understanding how God is the Saviour of all men, although multitudes will die "the second death;" not, however, in consequence of Adam's sin, but of their own wilful rebellion, and that alone. Herein, also, do we see how strictly and emphatically true it is, that Christ is the "life of men?" Since the race forfeited life in Adam, and by his offence, no man has ever breathed one breath of life, whether temporal, spiritual, or eternal, but in and through the "second Adam," "who is the Lord from heaven."

Thus, we see how the death of Christ has been undervalued—They have ascribed to man an "immortal soul," and told us that it could not die. But if it be true, and true it is, that, since the race forfeited life in Adam, no man has ever breathed one breath of life, whether temporal, spiritual, or eternal, but in and through the second Adam;

then, the doctrine that man has an "immortal soul," which cannot, and does not die, is a fiction, a real tradition of paganism. This doctrine is calculated to underrate, to undervalue the death of Christ, and ascribes that to an "immortal soul" which really and positively belongs to the "second Adam, the Lord from heaven." Indeed, if man has an immortal soul, we do not see any possible escape from the deistical notion that Adam's sin exposed him and his posterity to the pains of hell forever! For our first parents would have died, and if they had an immortal soul, that of course, no matter what became of the body, would have suffered hell torments forever, if the popular view be correct! We do hope, for the sake of truth, that our opponents will undertake to show us how this result can be otherwise than true upon the hypothesis that man has an immortal soul!

That man is a physical, moral, and mental being, we have before shown, and this, therefore, will not be argued now. But what do we understand by his physical nature? We understand that he is an organized being, consisting of bones, muscles, nerves, brain, flesh, blood, &c. What do we understand by his moral nature? We understand, by his moral nature, those powers, or faculties of the human mind, which constitute him an accountable being. Such are the following: Conscience, or conscientiousness, the sense of justice, of right and wrong, &c. Benevolence, faith, or marvellousness, which gives the tendency to believe. Hope, or the desire and expectation of future good. The sentiment of veneration, which gives the tendency to adore, &c. We understand by man's intellectual powers, those faculties of the mind which reason, perceive, compare, judge, &c. Man, then, differs from the inferior animals in the following particulars:

1. Man was made in the image of God—the beasts were not.
2. Man was neither mortal nor immortal, but susceptible of either; and the beasts were mortal.
3. His intellectual faculties are more numerous, and of a more exalted and refined character than theirs.
4. He has some mental powers which they have not.
5. He has a moral nature, which they have not.
6. He is a responsible, accountable being, and they are not.
7. He is susceptible of immortality and eternal life, and they are not.
8. He has the gift of speech, which they do not possess.
9. He will be raised from the dead, and the beasts, so far as we learn, will not.
10. He is the subject of rewards and punishments, and they are not.

The principal items of resemblance are the following:

1. Both have animal bodies.
2. Both have souls—see Gen. i. 20.
3. Both have spirits—see Eccle. iii. 21.

UNIVERSALISM.

The following occurrence speaks volumes as to the power of truth to "stop the mouths" of Universalists. The "Non-Universalist" is a resident of New York city; well known as a most kind and Christian man. He was a few years ago convinced of the truth—"All the wicked will God destroy." A short time since he sent the following article to the "New York Christian Messenger," a Universalist paper.

MR. EDITOR:—There is one argument, which, with my present views, seems to conflict severely with the doctrine of Universalism, vindicated in your paper, and I have no recollection of having seen or heard it answered at all. If, therefore, you will now answer it as conclusively as I admit, you *have* frequently exposed the fallacy of the doctrine of *Endless Torment*, I know not of another so powerful an argument against becoming a Universalist myself. The argument is simply this:

The Scriptures appear abundantly to prove that unbelieving men, dying in their sins, are not to be immortal, *i. e.*, that they are not to *live* for ever at all; neither in endless bliss nor endless misery.

Should it please you to give this argument a fair answer, as I doubt not you will, if you answer it, and in your next paper, by proving, or attempting to prove, *directly*, that the *souls* or *bodies* of *all* men will *live* for ever, in some supposed condition, it would please me to give your arguments a fair examination, and then to inform you, if I am satisfied therewith, or give you my reasons for it, if I am not.

Yours, respectfully,
A NON-UNIVERSALIST.

The "Messenger," instead of attempting an answer to this plain statement of Bible truth, resorts to the following expedient, which is found in that paper of Dec. 11th, 1847.

"Our unknown correspondent, a 'Non-Universalist,' is informed that we cannot comply with his request till we have his name. We always suspect those individuals who prefer darkness to light, and therefore must decline having anything to do with anonymous communications."

Reply to the "Messenger," sent Dec. 16, 1847, but not noticed by that paper.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—I am not surprised at your refusal to publish the argument sent you, of the non-immortality of the wicked, which was brought against Universalism, though your alleged reason for declining it was unexpected. I had imagined that your principal objection would be the difficulty of answering it to your own satisfaction, and your manner of disposing of it confirms the opinion. I have long supposed that names and characters of private individuals were not necessary for public advocates of any peculiar doctrine, in their publicly defending it, when assailed, and in a spot or point, too, previously undefended, as in this case. And as to your having my name, by which to publish and answer the argument, probably you are aware that inasmuch as the argument also assails your opponents' views, called the orthodox, a private individual would naturally feel averse to the personal hostilities he might expect from publishing his name under such circumstances. Joseph of Arimathea was afraid of the Jews for a while, though afterward, in perilous times, he boldly came forward. And as the case now stands, I am the more opposed to being made public in your

paper, from the fact of your having already commenced personalities, in classing me with "those individuals who prefer darkness to light." But there would be no objection to your having my name now, *confidentially*, and to be made public, should I hereafter so attack men's persons in this matter as to deserve a public chastening. To conclude: as the case is now, I appeal to the general usages of editors, whether you have, or have not, honourably acquitted yourselves as Christians and public defenders of the Holy Scriptures, in thus far suppressing the scriptural argument in question, instead of publishing and answering it directly, and as conclusively as it might be done in your opinion.

Yours, A NON-UNIVERSALIST.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY, 1848.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Our readers will see that we have given them about one quarter more matter in this number than in the last, by using smaller type. This course, if continued, will increase our expenses much above our original estimate; but the expressions of satisfaction with the January number, and the help sent us, has induced us to increase the amount of matter thus early, in the belief that the Providence of God, through our friends, will supply us with the requisite funds. We trust none will fail of doing whatever they think the cause of truth demands to sustain us. It will be seen, by our terms, that any person who sends us four new subscribers, with the cash, $2.00, will be entitled to the fifth copy without charge. We have received over one hundred subscribers monthly, for the last two months. All new subscribers will be supplied from the commencement of the present volume, unless they order otherwise, which we hope they will not do till we give notice that we cannot furnish the first numbers.

Our absence to Brooklyn, N. Y., and other engagements, have prevented us, personally, from furnishing much matter for the present number, but our lack of service is well supplied by our brother "ASSISTANT," and others. We intended an article on the "sixty-two weeks" of Dan. 9th, but must defer it. We had also prepared extracts from several letters which are crowded out.

COMMENDATORY LETTERS:—We have our full share of such letters, but our friends must excuse us for not publishing all they say in our favour. It savours too much of self-praise, and indicates that self-esteem is largely developed, to see an editor filling up much space with such letters; and, after all, adds nothing to the popularity of his labours. For private use such letters are comforting, and we thank our friends for them. We occasionally give extracts from them, but entirely disapprove of it, as a general thing. We had rather publish censure of ourselves than praise: the latter puffs up, the former humbles; and we have all more need of humility than pride.

OUR FRIENDS will forgive us for having said any thing in our December number, in *self* defence against an attack upon our veracity. Any *religious* paper that can stoop to make a personal attack upon the character of a brother, without ever having taken one gospel step with the supposed offender, and then refuse or neglect to correct the erroneous charge, when clearly pointed out, we shall strive to let pass in future. All will understand the reason. Let our opponents give us *argument* and we will meet them; if they give us personal abuse we will try to be silent, and leave our Master to vindicate us.

TO BE REMEMBERED:—Phrases used by our Lord and his apostles on the end of the wicked are:—First, *Literal*: Such as *die, death, perish, destroy, destroyed, &c.* Second, *Figurative:* these are always to be explained by the *literal*, and not the literal by the figurative. The literal are *plain and positive:* not *preservation* in any condition, but *destruction, death, &c.*, See Matt. 10: 28. The immortal soul theorists always reverse this order: they explain the literal by the figurative, and that leads straight down the road to spiritualism, and every other fanciful delusion. If such persons cry out against spiritualizers, they only condemn themselves; for they have laid the foundation, and others have built thereon.

IS THE DEVIL A FRIEND?

So some intimate. *To whom?* All the saints that die, to be sure! Who says so? The Bible, certainly! That is, if we believe what the defenders of the immortal soul theory say. Mr. "Winslow on the doctrines of Christianity," speaking of the "Intermediate state between death and the resurrection," says:—

"We wish to know, when death shall come to stare us in the face, and lay on us his icy fingers, what he is commissioned to *do* with us; whether to hand us over to the warm embrace of our Saviour, and the sweet fellowship of angel-spirits, or consign our panting spirits for unknown ages to the horrible gloom of annihilation."

Here is a very strong insinuation that "death is *commissioned* to hand us over to the warm embrace of our Saviour, and the sweet fellowship of angel-spirits." As the "Devil" has "the power of death" [see Heb. 2: 14,] he must "commission death to *do*" whatever it does; consequently, if Mr. Winslow is correct, the devil is indeed a kind friend to the saints! However, Peter represents the matter in a

different light. He says, "Your adversary the devil walketh about seeking whom he may devour:" 1 Peter 5: 8. Mr. Winslow and his coadjutors represent, unintentionally of course, the devil as the great benefactor of the saints! Truly "Christ and Belial" seem to have some "concord," if one receives and the other commissions *death* to "hand over the saints to the warm embrace of our Saviour!"

Mr. Winslow says:—

"The position which I am to demonstrate is this —*That between death and the resurrection, the souls of men, disembodied, are in a state of living, active, conscious existence, enjoying or enduring the retributions of eternity.*"

That position we should like to see "demonstrated," if it can be done. If no writer has come nearer to it than anything we have seen from Mr. W.'s pen, we are quite sure it does not begin to be demonstrated. Will the learned gentlemen be kind enough to give us a little light on his discovery that the Bible teaches that any body "*endures the retributions of* ETERNITY?" The phrase "eternity" occurs but once in our translation of the Bible, viz., Isaiah, 57: 15, and is there applied to "the high and lofty one." As to a sinner's ever "going into eternity," we have yet to learn that the Scriptures warrant any such doctrine. When "dead" they "know not any thing," when raised from the dead they are judged and condemned to the "second death;" then they are "destroyed forever;" Psa. 92: 7; "Burned up, root and branch;" Mal. 4; 1; "Consumed into smoke;" Psa. 37: 20: "*Both soul and body destroyed;*" Matt. 10: 28.

"POWER OF CHURCHES."

BROTHER STORRS:—Will you allow me to present to your mind a few remarks on your objections to Br. Goodell's views of the power and right of churches?

Br. G. claims that churches have the same right as other volunteer associations to reject persons applying for membership. You object to "the idea of likening the church of God to any other associations." I understand Br. G.'s comparison refers simply to the right of receiving and rejecting members. If the church possesses this right, as I believe, there can be no solid objection to the comparison thus far. I understand you, however, to deny that the churches possess this right. You remark, "if the Lord has added a man to his church, shall man, or any body of men, take upon themselves to attempt to thrust that man out of the church of God?" Now, brother, although this question is most forcible to condemn those who reject the very persons whom they acknowledge to be true christians, it has no force in respect to the claim and right of every church to judge *whom the Lord has added to his church and whom he has not*, and to receive and reject accordingly.

It is true indeed that no body of men have any right to institute any other organization of the christian church than that which is found in the New Testament. But that very organization requires the exercise of the right of judging of the characters of men, whether they are such as the Lord has received, or whether they are such as the word of truth declares have no inheritance in the kingdom of God.

You remark, "I had as lief ask admission to the Church of Rome, as to any other church that claims the right to decide that I may be a member or not." Now, I ask, if you and your associated brethren do not claim this very right? If not, I think that your association is in a fair way to become quite as worthy of the appellation of a synagogue of Satan as of that of a christian church. But do you not in fact claim the right to decide that unrighteous and ungodly men, who have no inheritance in the kingdom of God, shall not be members of your christian association or church? You indeed will not reject any whom you believe "that Christ has received." So, I understand, Br. G. will say. You both, however, claim the right of judging of the evidences of christian character, and of the validity of the claim of individuals to the possession of those evidences.

You say, "Let both grow together till the harvest." Grow *where*, brother? Not in the *church*, but in the *world*. They are to grow together "*in the field*." "The *field* is the *world*." Matt. 13: 38. If "the tares," "the children of the wicked one," are to be permitted to grow with "the good seed," "the children of the kingdom" *in the church*, you are in error yourself in saying that "men may and ought to be rejected from christian fellowship for *practices* clearly condemned by the bible."

While I claim for myself and allow to others the individual right of judgment in respect to what constitutes christian character, and whom we will fellowship or not as such, I believe that Br. Goodell errs in one important respect, viz., in making more essential, in doctrine, to constitute christian character, than the word of the Lord warrants.* Consequently, he falls into the serious evil of rejecting those whom the Lord receives.

Truly yours in christian love,
HENRY GREW.

REPLY TO BR. GREW.

Our brother admits, in the first part of his article, nearly all we contend for. To his inquiry whether we and our associated brethren do not claim the right to decide that a particular person may be a member or not of the church, the answer is: We neither claim nor exercise any such right, for the plain reason that we believe the Head of the Church has forbidden us to do so; but we do claim and exercise the right to fellowship or not fellowship any person, according as the evidence appears to our individual minds for or against that particular person. We warn all, that "the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God"—that he who "eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to *himself*," not to the Church: we caution all, "Let a man *examine himself*, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." Not, let the *Church* examine him. We warn the

*I understand that Br. G. will not fellowship any one as a christian who believes the words of Jesus Christ, "My Father is greater than I," unless he at the same time believes that Christ is as great as his Father!

Church herself, at her peril, not to interfere between an individual soul and its Judge in this matter. Christ has not made his Church responsible for those that eat the Lord's supper unworthily, if it discharge its duty in warning the wicked. Our Lord himself had with him, "on the table," when he instituted the supper, "the hand" of one who had betrayed him; see Luke 22: 19—21. Those organizations that claim and exercise the right to determine, authoritatively, who shall or shall not be members of the Church, are quite as likely to become "synagogues of Satan" as we who claim no such right.

But, says our brother,—"You claim the right of judging of the evidences of christian character, and of the validity of the claim of individuals to the possession of these evidences." True: and we withhold or extend *fellowship* accordingly. But to be *members* of the Church of Christ is another and a very different matter. None but God can make such membership. No evidence appears to our mind, in the Bible, that any church ever assumed the right to make members. The idea that churches have that power, we believe, has led to all the *religious* persecutions since the days that Papacy had being.

Br. Grew quoting from my previous article,—"Let both grow together till the harvest"—asks, "*Where*, brother?" Our Saviour answers for me, "*Among the wheat:*" not simply in "the world." Our Lord, we apprehend, never supposed his followers would attempt to kill the wicked out of the world. Br. Grew's argument seems to imply that he thinks our Saviour supposed his followers might attempt to destroy the wicked out of the world. We think he saw the effort that would be made by fallible men to keep his church *pure*, and that in their zeal to do so they would be as likely to "root up the wheat" as the tares. He therefore restricted his people to the work of proclaiming the *truths* of the word of God and the Gospel of the Kingdom, with directions to leave the *winnowing* process to him "whose *fan is in his hand*."

Many of his professed followers have lost sight of their appropriate work and set themselves to making and unmaking *church members*. This has kindled the fires of persecution in the sectarian divisions into which the Church of Christ has been rent. More strife and contention has resulted from this course than from all other causes. They all profess to have the noble object to keep the church pure. "Wilt thou," say they, "that we go and gather up the tares?" Without waiting for the Master's answer, they hasten to use their wisdom to remove the tares from "*among the wheat.*" The Master cries, "Nay: lest while ye gather up the tares ye root up the wheat also with them. Let both grow *together* until the harvest. In the *time of the harvest I* will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn." "No," the sectarian churches cry, "*we* will have a pure church now: the tares shall not grow 'among the wheat' till the harvest." Thus, in disobedience to the Master, they set themselves to work, and as often bring tares into their churches and root out wheat from among them as otherwise. How can this but be the case? The best among them are fallible men, and often blinded by prejudices of which they themselves are not aware.

Let the followers of our Lord content themselves to proclaim the truth of God's word, according to their best understanding of it, and leave that truth to work the *purity* of men." "Sanctify them through thy truth," prayed the Son of God, and added—"Thy word is truth." He did not pray—sanctify them by church organizations, and so keep my church pure. He knew too well that no such organization ever would exist, till he come again, that would be competent to make or keep his church pure: he saw there would be a mixture of "tares among the wheat" till the end of the age, and warned his servants against attempts of their own to separate them from among the wheat any farther than the preaching of God's truth would produce such separation, by driving away such as could not endure sound doctrine.

Br. Grew says: "If 'the tares'—'the children of the wicked one,' are to be permitted to grow with 'the good seed'—'the children of the kingdom' *in the church*, you are in error yourself in saying that men may and ought to be rejected from christian fellowship for *practices* clearly condemned by the bible."

I have not said that the tares are to be permitted to grow "in the church;" nor do I believe they do grow in the Church of Christ; but, they do grow "*among* the wheat:" but though they are among the wheat, they are not *in* the Church of our Lord's building: they are, indeed, in the sectarian churches, and the more the sects attempt to root them up the more they multiply: and no wonder, for those churches are not identical with the Church of Christ, and are trying to do a work which our Lord forbid.

Our view of the matter is this: When a professed Christian is guilty of a "*practice* clearly condemned by the Bible," he, by that act puts himself out of the true church, or is excluded by the Head of the Church, *authoritatively; i. e.*, by the word of truth; and the witness of the Spirit is withdrawn from him. The Church, individually, then regards that person according to the evidence he manifests to them of the fact that he has lost his membership: if that evidence is clear to each individual, they, individually, withdraw fellowship from him: not to do so would be, themselves, to lose fellowship with Christ. The true Church of Christ have no power to receive *members* into that body; nor have they any to "root out" members authoritatively: its Lord has entrusted it with no such power; and has warned it against the exercise of such power in the very parable before us. Br. Grew's mistake is in supposing that some such "organizations must exist as are called churches in these days, in which the "man of sin" has power over the saints and "prevails against them;" and will continue to do so "until the time comes that the saints possess the kingdom." These sectarian organizations are the master-piece of deception, to carry out the determination to "root up the tares" in opposition to the command of the Head of the Church. If we mistake not, Br. Grew himself has been the victim of this sectarian despotism. We think, however, in his case, the wheat was, as is often the case, rooted up instead of the tares. But how else could the sectarian church maintain its existence? It *makes* church members and *unmakes* them according to its will or judgment, fallible as it is. In this city, three or four years ago, a Baptist Church published its act in excluding some dozen *members* from their body for a change

of sentiment, and concluded by saying:—"It is due to the excluded brethren to say, that the Church believes them to be *good Christians.*" Thus, according to their own confession, they rooted up the wheat. Surely those "brethren" ought to rejoice that they are out of *such a church.*

Brooklyn N. Y.—The Editor of the Examiner spent two Sabbaths, and the week intervening, in that city, and preached twelve times. He had an attentive and candid hearing, and trusts that much good will be the result of his visit there. The friends subscribed nobly for the Examiner, and otherwise contributed to help us, for which they have our most hearty thanks.

The "*Six Sermons,*" can be had, by the friends in that immediate vicinity, of Brother James Mortimer, 82 Fulton St., also, Brother Walsh's "Aspects of Phrenology on Revelation," &c.

Post Offices must be looked after by our subscribers. Some connected with those establishments seem to think our paper so good they cannot deliver it. Considerable complaint has been made to us in this matter.

THE AGE TO COME.

Inquiries and Reply.

We totally disapprove the practice of appending *notes of interruption* to communications; and are resolved never more to practice it. Let a writer say what he wishes, and then reply. The following letter of inquiry from Br. Bell, Weed's Port, N. Y., and the reply by Dr. Thomas, are both interesting:—

Br. Bell's Letter of Inquiry.

Br. Storrs:—In perusing your valuable paper, I find much to admire, many new and pleasing ideas advanced, as well as some that I am not fully prepared to endorse, at present. The idea that the wicked are not immortal, and that they will be finally destroyed after the last resurrection and final judgment, appears to me to be both rational and Scriptural, as well as being more in conformity with the character and government of a both just and merciful God, than that of endless existence in misery. Your views of the sleep of the dead, and the intermediate state, &c., I am not fully satisfied with, as yet; but of their correctness or incorrectness I shall say nothing at present.

There have been some ideas advanced in some of your selected articles, in regard to the future age, the next dispensation, or the Millenium, which I wish to notice—not for argument's sake, but for the sake of information or further light on those very interesting and important subjects. You will recollect that in an article from the editor of the "Herald of the Future Age," No. 9 of your paper, (a very able and well written piece,) in speaking of the Messiah's kingdom, which he says is soon to be introduced or set up, he denominates it "an indestructible kingdom, and that those who are appointed to its honours, dignities, offices, &c., in the beginning of it, will retain them as long as it lasts; and as it is everlasting, it is very obvious that flesh and blood, or mortal men cannot inherit it." Again, he states "that it is to absorb all other kingdoms, and to exist as a new dispensation for a thousand years; and that before the saints can possess the kingdom, they must arise from among the dead; or if any such be living, that they must be changed from flesh and blood, which is corruptible, into flesh and spirit, a combination which is indestructible and deathless." Now, that the dead saints will rise, and that those among the living that are found worthy, will be changed, I have no doubt; but he intimates that none will live on the earth, or exist during that age, or dispensation, but immortals, or such as have, either by the resurrection or transformation, passed from a state of corruptibleness to a state of indestructibility. Now, if these things are so, I must acknowledge that I have misunderstood the literal interpretation of the Scriptures; and with all due deference to the opinion and abilities of the author, I will here propose a few questions for your explanation.

And 1st. I would inquire, if none but the immortal saints are to exist on the earth during the Millenium, or reign of Christ a thousand years, who are the saints to reign over? for, he admits (as Paul declares) that the "saints shall reign as kings, and officiate as priests in the new imperial monarchy to be founded by Christ." Can we suppose they are to reign over one another? or would it not be more reasonable, as well as more in accordance with the numerous predictions of the Prophets, and declarations of the Apostles, that they will be heirs and joint-heirs with Christ in his reign over the remnant of the Jews and those that are left of the nations of the earth in the flesh, which will, at the commencement, or during that dispensation, be converted to Christ, through their ministrations and agency?

Again, I inquire: is there much force in the argument that attempts to prove that none can exist in the mortal state, during that dispensation, because that the reign of Christ and his saints is said to be everlasting? Is not this reign or dispensation confined and limited to a thousand years? And may not the age of men in the flesh, when Satan is bound, the curse, with the causes of sin and death removed from the earth, live even a thousand years? Once more, I inquire: if none are to exist in the flesh, who are those that Satan is to deceive at the end of the thousand years? Is it possible that he can deceive the immortal saints that have dwelt and reigned a thousand years with Christ on the earth, and they thus become subjects of destruction, when they are already both "indestructible and deathless"? Or, must we be driven to the very inconsistent conclusion of Mr. Miller, that they will consist of the wicked *dead* after the last and final resurrection!

There is one idea more I wish to notice, contained in the very excellent article on "The Millenium and New Jerusalem contrasted," by Wm. Ramsey. Near the conclusion of his article, he says that in the "fifth or Millenial dispensation, the Messiah, as the Son of David, shall reign in humanity over this world." He also says that "the dead saints will be raised, and be associated with Christ *in his reign* during the thousand years; but they will probably be invisible to those in the flesh." Now, here I have another question to ask: Have we not just as much reason to suppose that the saints will be visible, as that Christ will be

visible? And if the saints are not to be visible, have we not reason to fear that Christ's reign will not be either visible or personal, but spiritual? for we are told, that where he is they shall be; they shall see him as he is, and be like him. Does not this idea savour too much of the spiritualists' mode of interpretation? Please answer these inquiries, and thus oblige an anxious inquirer after truth.

ISAAC BELL.

—

BR. THOMAS' REPLY TO BR. BELL.

THE SOCIAL BASIS IN THE AGE TO COME.

BR. STORRS:—A letter from an intelligent correspondent, addressed to you, and signed "Isaac Bell," is before me, and to which, at your request, I offer the following explanation. I would remark summarily, that there is no difference at all between my views and Mr. Bell's on the subject of his letter. The difficulty in his mind which has created the misunderstanding specified in his epistle, I perceive to be, a want of distinct apprehension of *the difference between* INHERITING *the Kingdom and being* A SUBJECT *of the Kingdom*. I quoted Paul, that "flesh and blood, or mortal men, cannot *inherit* the Kingdom," from which he infers that I teach, that "flesh and blood" cannot be the subjects thereof, and consequently "intimate that none will live on the earth, or exist during that Age (the Future) or Dispensation, but immortals, or such as have either by the Resurrection or Transformation passed from a state of corruptibleness to a state of indestructibility;" hence, with this supposition before him, he very pertinently inquires, if there be no mortals then on earth, "who are the saints to reign over?" This reminds me of a similar question I put to one of Mr. Miller's friends, a preacher, at a big meeting in Aurora, Indiana, in 1843, I think it was. He had preached the *dogma* (for it is certainly not *doctrine*) that all the wicked would be burned up when Christ came—not one of them be left on earth—and then the saints would possess the Kingdom under the whole heaven. "If this be so," said I, "who are the saints to reign over?" "Oh," said he, "it will be Paradise restored, and as Adam reigned over the beasts, so will the saints reign over them likewise!" "Indeed," I rejoined, "that is very curious: does not the Scripture say, that 'to him that overcomes I will give power over *the Nations*, and he shall rule them;' will you please inform me at what epoch God distributed them [the beasts—G. S.] into nations, and determined the bounds of their habitation?" This *reductio ad absurdum* put an end to further conversation on the subject.

At the same meeting, another preacher had affirmed, that, when Christ came death would be abolished; the inference from which was, that immortals only would dwell on earth for the ensuing 1000 years. Really, sir, said I, that is a very singular speculation in face of the "testimony," that, under the New Heavens and New Earth, when Jerusalem shall be a rejoicing and her people a joy, "the child *shall die* a hundred years old;" and "*the sinner* being 100 years old shall be accursed." Here childhood, sin and death, are set forth as existing in Israel, the most favoured nation of the Future Age, when the Lord rejoices in Jerusalem and joys in his people; will they not also obtain throughout the globe? Sinners a hundred years old in the Land of Israel and no death! how do you reconcile this with Paul's saying, that "the wages of sin is death?" But he turned away, and did not vouchsafe to answer.

I mention these incidents to show that I have always maintained the ground, ever since I turned my attention to the subject, that there will be parentage, sin and death, under Messiah's *personal* and only reign upon the earth. The expectation of possessing a share in a Kingdom and Empire without subjects, or of reigning, like a drover, over quadrupeds, as the dominion of the Future Age, is no part of my Hope, or understanding of the Law and the Testimony.

To inherit, or possess, an estate or thing, is a very distinct idea from that of being a part of the thing inherited. A Russian nobleman inherits an estate in which are included the serfs or slaves upon the soil; he becomes the head or chief, but he is not, therefore, any part thereof. The serfs work the land, they minister to his necessities, and his enjoyments, but they do not, therefore, inherit or possess. If they hold any portion of the soil, it is only as *tenants at will*,—until death or the will of their lord ejects them. So, in the Future Age, the Saints are the Noblemen—the Aristocracy of the World—who derive the patents of nobility from God. They inherit or possess all terrestial things in a royal copartnery with Jesus, who is the Chief of the Inheritors. "The meek shall inherit the earth," and "the saints shall rule the world," and command the services of the Heavenly Host. The nations will be their serfs—first subjugated by violence, then yielding a willing and grateful service until seduced by Satan from their allegiance—inherited by virtue of their divine right to the soil of Palestine and the secondary dominion of the earth attached. Hence, the basis of the social fabric of the Future Age or Dispensation of the Fulness of the Appointed Times, or world to come, of 1000 years' continuance—the true INTERMEDIATE STATE; a state *intermediate between* the Times of the Gentiles and the Third, or Eternal Heaven—the basis of society in the coming age is the fruition of a convulsion by which every principality, power and dominion, whether monarchy, empire, or republic, now extant upon the globe, will be demolished and forever abolished:—by which nobles, princes, kings, emperors, popes, priests, clergy, presidents, governors, office holders, fleets and armies, will be suppressed, leaving only an undistinguished and headless multitude, which "*shall wait for* HIS *law*," who shall "bind their Kings with chains, and their Nobles with fetters of iron." He will appoint "princes throughout all the earth."—*Ps.* 45: 16. These princes are "the children of the Promise;" become the sons of God by believing the promise made to the Fathers—"the things concerning the Kingdom of God, *and* the name of the Lord Jesus Christ;" and by such believers being immersed into the glorious name in hope of the things believed, even in full assurance of these *and* of those things affirmed concerning Jesus. Having thus "put on Christ" and being "Christ's they are Abraham's seed (for it is the children of the promise—believers of the promise—that are counted for the seed) and heirs according to the promise." These sons of the Divine Father, and brethren of the eldest Son of God, having, like Him, become the sons of God with power, according to their holy, spiritual and

angelic nature, by a resurrection from the dead—will be distributed and appointed throughout the world as the undying and permanent successors of "*the powers that be.*" Is not this sufficiently plain to prevent future misapprehension?

Leaving Mr. Ramsey to extricate himself as he best can, from what appears to me his inextricable difficulty and most inexplicable speculation of an invisible saintly rule, I subscribe myself affectionately, your fellow servant in hope of ruling the subject nations with a strong sceptre, decorated with a crown of life and a robe of righteousness, with honour, immortality, and an eternal weight of glory in the Future Age.

JOHN THOMAS,
Editor Herald of the Future Age.

Richmond, Va., Dec 26, 1847.

SELECTED.

From the Truth Seeker.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

[Concluded.]

The fact is, that while the more Scholarly priests of the age know very well that in the Greek Scriptures there are *distinctions* not preserved in the translation, it would not do to let their 'sheep' into the secret, lest their control over them should be weakened. It is by a slavish 'fear,' not by a scriptural 'faith,' that they drive their flocks into their sectarian folds; and hence it is, that they dislike a truth-seeking Christian Re-storer, far more intensely than a sensualist, 'whose god is his belly,' or a mammon-worshipper, or even a downright Atheist. Such characters they will honour, and even associate with, in general society; but the pure-living, free-thoughted, and zealous-hearted New-Testament Christian, they will denounce, defame, and if possible destroy. If they cannot *burn* him, they will *starve* him; and if they cannot consume his carcase, they will calumniate his character.

Now, "O" is clearly the victim of the species of fraud to which we allude. He fancies that 'Hell is *a place of torment*, and of the *second death.*' He means of course, by Hell, some *place* represented by the Greek term translated 'Hell,' for the English word, from the Saxon, simply signifies a *Hole*. But, firstly, I beg to inform him, that the Greek '*Ades* does not denote 'a place of *torment*,' in a single literal passage; nay, that nine times out of eleven in which it occurs in the New Testament, it does not signify a 'place' at all, but a *state!* Secondly, I must remind "O," that in jumbling together 'Hell' and 'the second death,' he is paying very little respect to the 'plain declarations' of that Scripture which he so gratuitously recommends *me* not to reject! In fact, in identifying the two, he acts just as absurdly as if he were to mistake the *pot* for the *potato*, or the *pan* for the *pottage!* These, however, I have long since learnt, are distinctions very easily lost sight of by the disciples of the priests, whether of Rome, Oxford, or Homerton. Indeed they have acquired in perfection the old Pharisaic art of 'straining out the gnats' of Heresy, and 'swallowing the camels' of Orthodoxy! The Scripture says, that 'the Devil was *cast into* the lake of fire'; but surely the Devil was *not* the lake of fire? So with equal explicitness, Scripture affirms that, 'Death and *Ades* were *cast into* the lake of fire.' Now, then, can '*Ades*, 'the place of torment' in Luke 16: 28, be also the place *into which* it was itself cast? How can the contained be also the container? I leave "O" to reflect upon the problem at his leisure, only repeating his own question, 'What meaning is there in these figures, if they do not show that Hell is' NOT 'the place of the second death?'

The passage in Mark 9: 46, is a quotation from (probably the Septuagint version of) the closing chapter of Isaiah. I will furnish "O" with a translation.

"22 For as the new Heaven and the new Earth, which I make, REMAIN (*meno*) before me, says the Lord, even so shall your seed and your name CONTINUE (*remor.*) 23 And it shall come to pass from month to month, and from sabbath to sabbath, that ALL FLESH shall come, to worship before me in *Jerusalem*, says the Lord. 24 And they shall go *forth, and* SEE THE CARCASES *of the men* that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched: and they shall be *an abhorring spectacle to* ALL FLESH."

What the vulgar Christians of the day make of this I cannot tell. Surely they do not entertain the frightful fancy, that 'the spirits of the just' occasionally pass 'the great gulf fixed' between God's Heaven and the fire-Hell, to look upon the resurrection 'carcases' of the wicked, broiling upon infernal gridirons? Such a spectacle is just what they represent the devils themselves to delight in; have the saints a similar taste? Yet if they do *not* believe this atrocity, what is the quotation to *their* purpose?

The *worm* and the *fire* are, with Isaiah, irresistible instruments of DESTRUCTION; one to consume the *flesh*, the other to calcine the *bones* of 'the carcases;' *why* should we suppose then, that Christ, 'the Mercy-seat' and Messiah of God, should convert them into instruments of TORTURE; instruments not only immortal *themselves*, but somehow *conferring immortality* upon the fuel they are said to destroy! Away with such wretched and contradictory ravings! For the honour of Christianity, let us have no more of them.

I shall not, here, show more fully what the passage really does mean; it is sufficient that I demonstrate that it does *not* denote 'eternal torture.'

It is said, that the virtuous shall *remain* before the Lord: i. e. *continue*, with all their faithful seed, to *live in the conscious presence of their Creator.* But the transgressors will *not* continue; they will be utterly consumed, and therefore CEASE: or, in the accordant language of Paul, Sylvanus, and Timothy, they will be '*punished* with everlasting destruction *from the presence of the Lord.*' Nothing shall finally *remain* of them, for even their 'carcases' will be fully consumed under the operation of the inextinguishable, because omnipotent, instrument of divine wrath.

Thus, then, the facts that this language is applied to judgments in 'the flesh;' that it has reference to feelings in the flesh, such as abhorrence, and to motives which only obtain in this disciplinary state; and that there is a *difference in duration* clearly expressed between the fate of those who shall *continue*, and those who shall *not*; of which 'infinity' does not admit: render the quotation incapable of proving 'the *ever-lasting torment* of human *souls*.'

Similar language occurs in the Septuagint version of Isaiah 34: in a prophecy of the *earthly* desolation and *limited* doom of Idumea.

"8 For it is the day of the judgment of the Lord,

and the year of the recompense of Sion in judgment. 9 And her valleys shall be turned into pitch, and her land into sulphur; and her land shall be as pitch burning night and day. 10 And IT SHALL NEVER BE QUENCHED, and her smoke shall go up; it shall be made desolate *throughout her generations*. And FOR A LONG TIME birds and hedgehogs, and ibises and ravens, shall dwell in it."

The same language is employed by Christ, by Jude, and by the writer of the Apocalypse, and, I maintain, in the very same sense.

(4) In reply to the fourth argument, embodied in the question, 'How can ungodly men, if they cease to exist, *dwell* with the devil and his angels?' I reply, first, that their ceasing to exist *now*, neither excludes a *future* existence of *limited* suffering, nor includes a torment of *infinite* duration; second, that the Scripture does *not* affirm that men will *dwell for ever* with the devil [whatever He may represent,] '*cast into* the lake of fire, WHICH IS THE SECOND DEATH;' hopeless and everlasting: on the contrary, Revelation and Reason alike inform us, what is the *consequence* of being cast into such a dreadful agent of DESTRUCTION. The wicked are consumed, killed in soul, burnt up, perish, and for ever. This is 'the second death;' for, indeed, 'who CAN *dwell* with the *devouring* fire? 'who CAN *dwell* with everlasting burnings?' The terms are contradictory; the supposition an impossible absurdity.

(5) 'Ever-*lasting* punishment' MAY mean a *never-ending* punishment. In the case in question I have never said that it does not: the difference concerns the *nature*, not the duration, of the penalty of sin. But still it is an undoubted fact, that the *terms translated* 'for ever,' 'everlasting,' etc., do not *necessarily* and *invariably* mean eternal. The nature of the subject limits them; just as above, where I say—'I have *never* said.' This does not imply my 'eternal' existence, does it?

But do the promises of God really hang upon *one phrase* only? Is there such poverty of language in the Bible that we must have recourse to fallacy in order to hold fast to our 'immortal hope?' Not so! God has declared, in various phrase, that while the sinner *must* DIE, the righteous shall LIVE—shall NOT DIE. But even if He had not, the very nature of the case would lead infallibly to the inference. He who hath begun the good work, and given us the life of ages, will '*continue*' that life in his presence, and the seed of virtue shall '*remain*.' No one can pluck the good out of the Saviour's hand: '*neither can they die any more*.' [Luke 20: 36.]

I have now passed in review the 'Scriptural reasons' of my brother Truth-Seeker, and shall be glad if my remarks at all aid him in his further search. My own impression is, that it is quite useless for him 'to multiply reasons,' since the *number* cannot make up for the badness of the *nature*. But, in truth, he has already advanced his '*strong* reasons'; those behind can only fill up the gaps of the phalanx to the eye, without rendering the regiment stronger; they are like the drest-up clowns in a play, standing as a back-ground to the real Actors, but themselves taking no part in the performance: they have the soldier's coat, but not his courage!

"O" admits that my 'doctrine appears so agreeable to his *fallen* nature, that he should be *glad* to believe it true.' I can fully credit this statement. But does he not mistake the reason? Is it not his *love* of God and man that prompts to this faith? But *fallen* love, or *depraved* benevolence, are terms I cannot comprehend; they do not consist together; It is not the fallen, but the *un*fallen principle of man's nature which renders a rational and loveable exhibition of the Divine character so pleasing; just as it is the selfish and gloomy pride of priests which makes so many of them *delight* in preaching 'the doctrine of devils,' and 'the torments of the damned.'

I have already shown that the proclamation of the doctrine of eternal destruction as the Divinely appointed punishment of the impenitent, did *not* produce the fruits of unrighteousness in the Church at Thessalonica, and I am not aware of its having ever done so since. On the contrary, while I *know* that the advocates of that doctrine in Britain and America, are amongst the most moral, truly pious, and virtue-loving of mankind, I am equally persuaded that it is *not so* with the great mass of vulgar Christians. I do not believe that two-thirds of the professing Church are truly religious and converted characters. Cant phrases, outside formalities, fierce fanaticism, and all that can be *simulated* in religion, are visible enough; but self-denial, knowledge, temperance, charity—where are they? The 'religious world' is a huge sham, pervaded at heart with the persecuting, selfish, deceitful, and diabolical spirit of the old Pharisees. 'The Church,' in short, is a 'whitewashed sepulchre,' notwithstanding your Evangelical Alliances, not a cleansed Temple for pure and loving souls. Of course, there are many individual exceptions—some Gamaliels and Josephs amid the mass—some grains of corn amongst the chaff. And this state is *just* what was predicted. Were Christ to return in person, as he has in spirit, he would scarcely find faith upon the earth. The reigning religion is a monstrous machinery of fashion, pulpits, and power. In America it is the stronghold of Slavery; in Britain the citadel of Intolerance. The primitive Truth has been corrupted and concealed, and the condition of the world now demands that the real Christian, and sincere Truth-seeker, should do something to restore it to its primitive purity and power.

The doctrine of HELL—with its flame and sulphur, its roasting spirits and tormenting devils—has been tried quite too long. Let us try what the truth of Heaven will do. We have faith in *Knowledge;* we have hope in truth. But Fear is at once a pitiful slave, and a cruel tyrant: it never did, it never will, get one soul to Heaven. Even in earthly matters it never re-forms: how then can it re-generate? Love casteth out fear; this is *one* side of truth; and the other is, Fear casteth out love. The terrors of the law cannot *educate*, but only restrain: beyond a certain point, they cease to do even that. Our cruel laws, we know, actually *engender* crime; and they do so because they root up the last remnants of *love* and *respect*. We are finding this out in the affairs of earth, but theologists still persist in palming our pernicious errors upon the economy of Heaven! Nevertheless, men will only be made virtuous, and prepared for paradise by education, knowledge, and truth. Terror will not answer the end proposed. God does not *drive* man to heaven with the lash of fear, he draws them with the cords of love.

But I will not enter further into this question of reason, and the *supposed* immoral tendency of the doctrine. Let it be first proved what is the *scriptural theory;* I shall then be ready to discuss the tendency of it. I will add, however, a cautionary remark from one of the most consummate logicians and most able theologians of the day—Archbishop

WHATELY—who is also favourable to the theory of Holy Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy.

'In speaking of the rewards and punishments of the next world, I have always *studiously confined myself as closely as possible*, to that which has been revealed to us in Scripture; for there is no subject in which it is *less safe to trust such conjectures* as *our own reason may lead to*; being one which is the more mysteriously difficult the more it is considered.'

I hope that when our friend ("O") has *himself* more maturely considered the *pros* and *cons* of this question, he will announce his opinions with somewhat less of that air of reproof and dogmatism which characterizes the latter portion of his epistle.

PATHFINDER.

THE SON OF GOD.

The following is the first of a series of numbers, which we extract from the writings of HENRY GREW, of this city, on the character of our Lord Jesus Christ. We hope they will not only be read, but *studied*. Br. Grew, in the preface to his work, says:

"Deeply impressed with a sense of the importance of obtaining, so far as is revealed, a correct knowledge of 'the only true God,' and of Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent, I have humbly endeavoured to 'search the Scriptures,' looking unto Jesus for the guidance of his holy Spirit which he promised his disciples to lead them into all truth. The result of this investigation has been delightful, though labourious." * * * *

"I beg leave to remark to the reader, that it is necessary to remember, that however firmly he may believe his present sentiments, no man is *infallible*. To read any work of this kind, with such positive assurance of our present views, as is consistent only with infallibility, is useless. We may as well cry out heresy, the moment we know an author's sentiments are contrary to our own, as to do so after we have heard his arguments, for such a feeling of mind will resist the most conclusive proofs, and prevent our conviction of the most important errors." * * * * *

NO. I.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIVINE TESTIMOMY CONCERNING THE HIGHEST CHARACTER AND GLORIOUS PERFECTIONS OF THE SON OF GOD.

1. *The testimony of the Prophets.*

Isa. 9: 6. And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, &c. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, &c. Isa. 7: 14; Matt. 1: 23. Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted, is, God with us. Micah 5: 2. Whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. John 3: 31. He that cometh from Heaven is above all. John 1: 34. And I saw, and bear record that this is the Son of God. John 3: 36. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him.

2. *The testimony of the Apostles.*

John 1: 1—3. In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. Eph. 3: 9. God created all things BY Jesus Christ. Rev. 19: 13. And his name is called the Word of God. John 20: 28. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and My God. Rom. 9: 5. Christ—who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen. Col. 2: 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Col. 1: 15. Who is the image of the invisible God; the first-born of every creature, for by him were all things created, &c. Heb. 1: 3. Who being the brightness of his (the Father's) glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, &c. Acts 10: 36. He is Lord of all. John 2: 25. He knew what was in man. John 6: 64. Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him. John 1: 4. In him was life. Matt. 9: 35. And Jesus went, &c., healing every sickness, and every disease among the people. Matt. 14: 33. Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped him. John 9: 38. And he worshipped him. 2 Pet. 3: 18. To him be glory both now and forever. Amen. Rev. 1: 6. To him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen. Rev. 5: 12. Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. Rev. 5: 13. And every creature, &c., heard I saying, Blessing and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb, for ever and ever. Rev. 7: 10. Salvation unto our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb. Matt. 16: 16. Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. Acts 9: 20. And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God. Heb. 4: 14. We have a great high priest that is passed into the Heavens, Jesus the Son of God. 1 John 4: 15. Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God. John 20: 31. But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God: and that believing ye might have life through his name. 1 John 5: 5. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God. 1 John 5: 10—13. Rom. 1: 3, 4. Rom. 14: 10. We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. 2 Cor. 5: 10.

3. *The testimony of Jesus Christ.*

Rev. 1: 17. I am the first and the last. John 8: 58. Before Abraham was, I am. John 10: 30. I and my Father are one. John 5: 22, 23. For the Father judgeth no man; but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father. John 17: 5. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. Matt. 28: 18. All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. John 17: 2. As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. John 10: 18. I have power to lay it down (my life) and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father. John 5: 26. For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself. Matt. 9: 6. The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins. Matt. 18: 20. Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of

them. Matt. 28: 20. Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Luke 22: 69. Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God. Matt. 25: 31. When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, &c. John 11: 25. I am the resurrection and the life. John 9: 35. Dost thou believe on the Son of God? John 3: 16. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life. John 3: 18. He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already; because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

4 *The testimony of God the Father.*

Heb. 1: 8. Unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever. 1: 6. When he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him. Zech. 13: 7. Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts. Matt. 17: 5. This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.

How glorious and precious is this divine testimony concerning the sinner's friend! Let us carefully examine what truths it plainly exhibits for our faith and love.

1. We have here most plainly revealed to us, that our blessed Saviour *really existed before he appeared on earth.* He was before Abraham. He was with the Father in the beginning, and possessed glory with him before the world was. He came down from Heaven. God created the world by him, consequently he must have *really* and *actually* existed in the beginning, and not merely in the divine purpose.

2. Here also the eye of faith beholds him with admiring joy, "*God over all.*" As by him all things were made, so by him all things consist. His throne is to endure through all generations.

3. *He is an object of worship.* To him every knee must bow. Angels are commanded to worship him. His disciples prayed to him and worshipped him.

4. In the divine character of the Son of God, he is presented to a dying world as *the only name "by whom we must be saved."* In him alone we have eternal life, believing in him as the "only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."

To Correspondents: "*What is Truth?*" is deferred for further consideration. In the meantime, we would suggest to the author, if the "sanctuary" is "the church," and that again is a "spiritual temple," it is to have no place in the New Jerusalem: see Rev. 21: 22. Our present view of the article is, that it is not such as we wish to place in the Examiner; but, can see no reason why those papers which still are the medium of similar articles should refuse it. "*The Diagram,*" by the same author, has been so often published, that we do not think it profitable to repeat it; but your remarks on the folly of attempting to "stretch the eight chronological points and dates" of Mr. Miller's theory, are appropriate. *Time,* however, will soon settle all that matter.

M. Bates: We have not seen the article of which you speak, in the "True Wesleyan." We have never received but two copies of that paper in exchange; we do not know why. As to "Edwards against Chauncy," Br. O. Scott and myself examined that argument together before I ever published a word on the destruction of the wicked. Br. Scott pronounced it no answer to my argument.

S. S. Rogers: We may publish in pamphlet if there are calls that warrant it.

Business Notices.

J. Marsh,—Money received; all right.

Orin Roberts: "Keith's Land of Israel" costs 75 cents, but cannot be sent my mail unless the cover is taken off. We have not the funds to put in Pamphlet form the work you speak of.

"Depository in Boston:" Several friends, East, have inquired whether we could not keep our "Six Sermons," &c., in Boston? We have not the funds to make any depositories: but, if any person will keep the works, and advance us the money on them, we put them very low. We cannot publish without cash; "silver and gold have *I* none."

Letters are not acknowledged in the Examiner, because nearly all who write us order something: if they receive what they order, they know their letters are received and the money they sent.

Timothy Lyon: We have sent a set of the papers to you, for which we make no charge.

J. Donaldson: The money in your previous letter paid for all we sent you, and for Vol. 3.

Wm. Algire: Your paper was sent at the same time the pamphlet was; the fault is in the Post Office: we have sent you another January number.

M. H. Tyler: We have sent you the pamphlets and six numbers of last year's Examiner, and credited you for Vol. 3.

David Hewitt: Bank broken—Bill returned.

All those wishing to advance scientific and mechanical researches in this country, we would recommend to subscribe to the *Scientific American,* published by Messrs. Munn & Co., New York, at Two Dollars per year.

The Editor of the Examiner preaches every Lord's day at Commissioner's Hall, Third Street, below Green, east side; at 10½ A. M., and in the evening at 7 o'clock.

The "Six Sermons" on the End of the Wicked, &c., can be had at No. 21 North Sixth Street, or of the Author, 18 Chester Street, between Race and Vine, 8th and 9th. Price, in Pamphlet, 15 cents, or 10 copies for $1.00. The pamphlet includes the views of the author on the question, "Have the dead knowledge?" The Sermons advocate the doctrine, that "All the wicked will God *destroy,*" or cause them to cease from life, after the judgment.

These Sermons can also be had of J. Marsh, Rochester, N. Y.; Dr. Fondey, 811 Broadway, Albany, N. Y.; and R. E. Ladd, Cabotvile, Mass.

We keep on hand the Sermons, full bound in morocco, and lettered, including our own and Brother Grew's views of the intermediate state of the dead. Price 37½ cents.

The "Bible Examiner" is published monthly, at 21 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; it is a super-royal octavo, of 16 pages. Its object is an examination of the Scriptures independent of all sects. The Editors, George Storrs, and John T. Walsh, maintain the opinion of the final and utter destruction of all the enemies of God, so that "they shall be as though they had not been."

Terms: Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; always in advance.

Newspapers giving the above an editorial insertion, will please send us the paper containing it, and their bill.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, MARCH, 1848. No. 3.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 21 N. SIXTH STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

PHILOSOPHY OF MAN.—NO. III.

By J. T. WALSH.

Import of the term soul.

We shall now turn our attention, exclusively, to the term soul as found in the Holy Scriptures, and try to learn its true import. But, before we commence the work before us, we will call attention to an acknowledged rule of interpretation, viz: 'All words are to have their primary and obvious meaning, unless there is a clear necessity for departing from it.' With this rule before us, we ask, what is the first, primary, and obvious meaning of the term soul? We answer, its primary meaning is life. Let us now examine the Bible upon this subject. And,

1. The term soul signifies life. 'And God said: Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life,' [Heb. soul,] &c. Gen. 1: 20. Again in the 30th verse, 'And to every beast of the earth, and to every foul of the air, and to every animal that creepeth upon the earth, in which is life,' &c.. [Heb. a living soul.] A. Cruden says, the term occurs in the 24th verse, where we have the phrase 'living creatures,' and means living soul. Lev. 17: 11, 'For the life [Heb. soul] of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; [lives;] for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.' See also the 14th verse. Ps. 33: 19, 'To deliver their soul from death,' [to save them alive.] Ps. 7: 5, 'Let the enemy persecute my soul [my life] and take it; yea let him tread down my life [soul] upon the earth.' Gen. 35: 18, 'And it came to pass as her [life] was in departing, [for she died,] that she called,' &c. 1 Kings 17: 21, 'Let this child's soul [life] come into him again.' Job 12: 10, 'In whose hand is the soul [life] of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind.' Job 31: 29, 'If I caused the soul of the owners to expire,' or have caused its owners to lose their life Rev. 16: 3, 'And every living soul [every thing that had life] died in the sea.' Job 17: 8, 'For what is the hope of the hypocrite, though he hath gained, when God taketh away his soul,' [his life.] Job 33: 18, 'He keepeth back his soul from the pit, and his life from perishing by the sword' The Lord kept him back from the pit of corruption, and saved his life from perishing, &c. Is. 53: 10, 'When thou shalt make his soul [his life] an offering for sin.' In the 12th verse, 'Because he poured out his soul [his lite, his blood] unto death.' 1 Sam. 24: 11, 'Yet thou [Saul] huntest my soul [life] to take it." 26: 11, 'Because my soul [life] was precious in thine eyes.' Thus we have given a few cases where the term soul, evidently signifies life. Many more could be given, but this is unnecessary, as, in those referred to, we have a fair specimen. The most illiterate can see that to substitute the term immortal soul, in the above texts, would make sad havoc of the word of God.

2. The term soul signifies the person, being, man, the whole man or person. Gen. 2: 7, 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul;' a living person or being. Gen. 14: 51, 'Give me the persons [Heb. souls] and take the goods to thyself.' Gen. 12: 5, See the place. Lev. 4: 2, 'If a soul [person] shall sin through ignorance.' In 27th verse: 'And if any soul [person] of the common people sin,' &c. Chap. 5: 1, 'If a soul [or person] sin, and hear the voice of swearing.' And in the 2d verse: 'Or if a soul [person, man, or woman] touch any unclean thing,' &c. Besides the souls, or persons, that went down into Egypt—the souls that were saved in the ark—the three thousand souls, or persons, who were saved on the day of Pentecost, &c., &c. There are hundreds of other places where this term is, undoubtedly, used in relation to the whole man, or person. 'Thou wilt not leave my soul [wilt not leave me] in hell, [the grave,] nor suffer thy holy one to see corruption.' Ps. 16: 10. With this quotation we pass on to the third proposition.

3. The term soul is used to signify a dead body, or dead person. Num. 9: 9, 'Some were defiled by the dead body [Heb. dead soul] of a man.' Num. 6: 6, 'He shall come at no dead body,' [dead soul.] Let none, then, ridicule the idea of dead souls, for it is a fact, that the term is so used in the word of God. Was not the soul of the Messiah dead when it was in the grave? But this is not all: every person will admit, that if a living person is a living soul, a dead person must be a dead soul. This must suffice for the third proposition; and more particularly as our object is to state them, and show their correctness without bringing forward a superabundance of testimony.

4. It is used in relation to the affections and the mind of man. David says: 'Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me? hope in God, for I shall yet praise him,' &c. Ps. 43: 5. See, also, several other places in the Psalms. Why am I cast down? Why is my mind within me dejected? hope in God, &c. As it is used in reference to the mind, it sometimes expresses the emotions, desires, and affections of the mind. Gen. 23: 8, 'If it be in your mind;' in Heb. if it be your soul, your wish, or desire. Sam.

18: 1, 'The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David; he had a great love and affection for him.' Prov. 27: 7, 'The full soul;' that is, a man whose desire or appetite is fully satisfied.

5. It is used as a figure of personification. Rev. 6: 6; 20: 4, 'I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they held,' &c. 'And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and who had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they [the souls] lived [they then were dead once] and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection.' 5th verse: 'John saw these souls as he saw the hundred and forty and four thousand, having their Father's name written on their foreheads.' And as he saw the sea of glass, and those who had gotten the victory over the beast, &c., standing on it praising God. He was in the isle of Patmos, and saw spread out before him the history of the future fortunes of God's church and people. He saw that many of the saints would be martyred for the testimony which they bore to the truth and for the word of God, and represents them, by the figure of personification, as being under the altar, upon which, no doubt, they had been immolated, crying for vengeance upon those who had put them to death. The same figure is used when the blood of Abel is represented as crying to God from the earth. God said to Cain, 'the voice of thy brother's blood cryeth to me from the ground.'

6. The term soul is used for being or existence. Perhaps some will think that this proposition is embraced in, and established by those to which we have already directed your attention. This, in fact, is true; but, my object in making it a distinct one now is, to answer an objection upon this subject, which is based upon the words of Christ in Matt. 10: 28, 'And fear not them who kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.' Here the term soul signifies being, or existence. This is one of the meanings of the original term, as given in the Lexicons. Christ then said to his disciples: 'And fear not those who kill the body, but are not able to put an end to your soul or existence; but rather fear him who is able to destroy, or put an end to the existence of both soul and body in hell.' Mark 8: 36, 37, 'For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain a whole world [in this state] and lose his own soul,' [in the next state;] lose himself, his life, his being, his existence. 'Or what will a man give in exchange for his soul?' his life. Luke 12: 4, 5, 'Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom you shall fear: Fear Him, who after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yes, I say to you, Fear him.' This throws light upon the language used by Matthew, and shows conclusively, that we have given a correct exposition of the matter. We see nothing then, in an examination of this subject, to authorize us to believe that man has an immortal soul. If he even becomes an immortal soul, it must be by a patient continuance in well doing, seeking for glory, honour, and immortality, which make up the sum total of eternal life.

WITCHCRAFT UNVEILED.—NO. III.

What can be said in favour of the phraseology of Samuel, on the supposition that JEHOVAH sent the spirit of the departed prophet to commune with Saul, and to announce to him the consummation of the predictions of offended Heaven? Saul's application to this infamous and impious woman, *praying* her to assume the attribute or power of the Deity, and to *coerce* the spirit of the pious dead to come at her bidding, for his pleasure, or in obedience to his will, because he considered himself forsaken by Heaven, and would employ Sorcerers, or resort to any thing in his desperation, and in open defiance to all authority, whether human or divine—this new and impious crime of Saul would have been the theme of Samuel, and would, most certainly, have been placed in the list, and at the top of his offences. Burning words, indignation, tribulation and wrath, for so high-handed and heaven-daring an offence, as Saul's last act must be branded, would have burst from the lips of the prophet, and an appeal to Saul's reason followed; instead of the recital of an old prediction, and a *whining* inquiry, to learn the *cause* of being thus *disquieted!*

WOULD THE SPIRIT OF A DEPARTED PROPHET, SENT BACK TO THE WORLD BY THE DEITY, ON AN ERRAND FROM HEAVEN, AS MUST HAVE BEEN THE CASE IN THIS INSTANCE, IF SAMUEL REALLY APPEARED, CALL IT BEING DISQUIETED, AND TACITLY CONSENT TO THE EFFICIENCY OF THE POWER OF AN INFAMOUS WITCH, A MISCREANT TOO VILE TO BE PERMITTED TO CUMBER THE EARTH? No! THE BARE IDEA IS ABSURD.

I affirm, most unhesitatingly, that the Witch of Endor needed no other auxiliary qualification, although it is probable that she possessed a very powerful one, to effect her purpose of deceiving Saul, than the very common one of modulating her voice, and addressing Saul when she *personated* Samuel, in a different tone from that used by her during her previous interview with the *mad* King of Israel.

JOSEPHUS, however, says, that the orders of Saul to his servants signified, "That they should seek out for him one of those women that could speak out of their bellies, and call forth the souls of the dead; that by this means he might know if his affairs should succeed. For this sort of *belly-speakers* can bring up the souls of the dead, and by their help can foretell futurities." In plain English the Witch of Endor, *in modern parlance*, was a *Ventriloquist*, and practised her art only in a private and mysterious manner, to further and aid her deceptions.

The whole machinery of imposition, stripped of its mummery, is very simple. The Witch has succeeded in her incipient manœuvres; and Saul, her complete dupe, is bowed to the ground, in the imaginary presence of the real spirit of the departed prophet Samuel. The bold and impudent woman, now *personates* the spirit of the prophet, and asks Saul the *cause* of calling him; adroitly pumping for a little information—"Why hast thou disquited me, to bring (or force) me up?" The Witch is careful to assert her power, as the agent of Saul, in this ghost-raising operation. Saul, who has now become a mere puppet in the toils of the Witch, declares the true condition of his affairs, which he, of course, was best qualified to communicate, and which the Witch was very desirous of learning. He says, "I

am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, AND GOD IS DEPARTED FROM ME, *and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams*—therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do." The Witch is now qualified to end the farce, and knowing the prediction, which, it was *notorious* throughout all Israel, hung over the head of Saul, and over his house, she tells over again an *old story* THAT EVERY MAN, WOMAN AND CHILD IN SAUL'S DOMINIONS WERE PRIVY TO. Therefore, again personating the spirit of Samuel, she continues the farce—"Wherefore, then, dost thou ask of me, seeing the LORD has departed from thee, and is become thy enemy?" And in her malicious triumph, she calls to her aid her well-tried impudence, and, without waiting for a reply from Saul, proceeds: "AND THE LORD HATH DONE TO HIM, AS HE SPAKE BY ME; for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbour, even to David; because thou obeyedest not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day."

It should be borne in mind, that impostors of this class are very particular in acquiring a readiness of utterance, in appropriate terms, of their oracular speeches; and that this woman would be particular in her imitation of the prophets of Israel, in any repetition that she should attempt of their prediction. The conclusion of the Witch's speech, in the character of Samuel, was undoubtedly dictated by her *cunning* and resentment. Her impudence was quite sufficient to enable her to risk all consequences. Therefore she adds, "Moreover the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines; and to-morrow shall thou and thy sons be with me; the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines." This woman must have known one thing, which stood prominently conspicuous in the dealings of God with the Israelites, viz:—That, IN ALL CASES, when the Lord signifies through the agency of his prophets or the priesthood, his disapprobation of the people or their rulers, they were *sure to be defeated* in their battles with their enemies. Her prediction, therefore, of Saul's defeat and death, was not only sanctioned by the old prediction of Samuel, but, in her opinion, rendered *certain*, from the information she had just received from Saul. The opportunity, therefore, for avenging herself on Saul, by her denunciations, which he was duped to believe were fresh from the mouth of Samuel, would facilitate the destruction of her enemy, Saul, by increasing his panic, and depriving him of his remaining courage and prudence. However, the Hebrew word rendered "*to-morrow*," which the Witch used, is so indefinite, as to time, that Saul's subsequent defeat and death, in any battle with the Philistines, would have fulfilled her prediction.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS.

By J. T. WALSH.

There are certain facts and circumstances connected with this case, which we shall briefly state. These *facts* and *circumstances* are of two classes—those relating to the *Witch*, and those relating to *Saul*.

1. Witches and wizards were *impostors* PRETENDING *to supernatural power*.

2. God had commanded their extermination—"thou shalt not suffer a Witch to live."

3. In the *practice* of their art, they *professed* to consult the dead; and were in the habit of "*peeping*" and "*muttering*."

4. JEHOVAH had forsaken Saul, and become his enemy; so that he *answered him not*—neither by prophet, nor by priest, nor by dreams.

5. Saul, in a perfect state of desperation, goes to the Witch, as the *last resort* to "*seek from the living to the dead*."

6. He visits her in "the night," a time most favourable to the practice of her imposture. And, lastly, she professess to bring Samuel up, where he was *not buried*. He was, we believe, interred at *Ramah*, some forty or fifty miles from *Endor*, at which place the Witch resided

Now, is it reasonable to suppose, that God, who had refused to answer Saul in any way whatever, would, by the hands of a Witch, make known Saul's destiny to him—a destiny which he had previously fully and explicitly announced to him by Samuel the prophet? God had said, "thou shalt not suffer a Witch to live;" and, if they were too *vile* to live, would God make use of them as instruments of communicating with Saul, with whom he had refused all communication by prophets and priests? This is not reasonable. Will the reader turn to Isaiah, and read the following: "And when they shall say to you, *Seek to them that have familiar spirits and to wizards that peep and that mutter:* SHOULD NOT A PEOPLE SEEK TO THEIR GOD—FOR THE LIVING TO THE DEAD?" Chap. viii. 19.

Here two questions are propounded.—1st, "Should not a people seek to their God"? 2nd, "For the living to the dead"? The last question is eliptical, and the *two*, when paraphrased, would read thus: "Should not a people seek to their God? Will you seek for the *living* to the *dead?*" Thus the Jews, in the days of Isaiah, were rebuked for consulting wizards and witches. They were taught the folly, the idolatry, the blasphemy, of "seeking unto the dead," for the benefit of "the living." And the reason of this is obvious; for "*the dead know nothing*," and, therefore, it is impossible to learn from them. And this *fact* is not sufficiently *guarded* by the Witch of Endor in her *personification of* Samuel; for she makes *him ask* Saul, "Why he had disquieted him?" when, in fact, upon the popular supposition, Samuel knew without asking the question!

May we not conclude, then, in the language of Isaiah, "To the law and to the testimony, for if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them?"

In conclusion, we hope the articles on this subject, which precede these remarks, will be read attentively; and if any friend, or foe, can give a better exposition, an exposition more consonant with the character of God and his Word, we hope they will enlighten the world on the subject.

IS ERROR CONSISTENT WITH SALVATION?

We give place to the following strictures and reply growing out of an article in the December number of the Examiner, wherein the author expressed the opinion that "believing in the immortality of the soul is a damnable heresy." We

understood the expression not in an *absolute* sense, but in its *tendency*. We certainly think such belief has a tendency to ruin more men than any one error ever introduced into the church. Not that it *necessarily* results in the death of those who embrace it, but, its natural and legitimate tendency is to sap the foundation of the whole system of gospel truth. We wish it distinctly understood that we do not endorse all that is said in either communication. We let both speak, and others must judge what is truth. With present light, we do not at all assent to the doctrine that "the Scriptures teach the *non-resurrection*" of any one.

Strictures by H. Grew.

Br. Storrs:—In your December number you have verily given us a notable example of the fact that "man is prone to extremes." It is found in the article from the "Her. Future Age," in which the learned editor reasons himself out of reason by coming to the conclusion that "believing in the immortality of the soul is a *damnable* heresy!" Thus he consigns millions of true penitent believers on the Son of God, and followers of the Lamb, to the lake of fire, which is the second death. Do you really believe, that if you had died previous to your present view of the subject, that you would have been condemned to eternal perdition? Such extravagant representations injure the cause of truth, as they tend to prejudice the mind against what we advocate, which is true.

This preposterous conclusion of the writer is traceable to two errors. First, confounding the importance of the existence of a fact, with the importance of a correct belief in the fact. Secondly, confounding the belief of an error with the belief of every other error with which that error is logically connected, or with the denial of every truth of which that error is "logically destructive."

The fact of the Son of God being what he really is, in respect to his nature, and of his doing what he really has done, *i. e.*, dying for us and rising from the dead, are of such importance as to be essential to the salvation of perishing men; but it does not necessarily follow that a correct belief in these facts is thus essential. To sustain this conclusion, it must be proved, either that God has made the correct knowledge and belief of what his Son is, and of what he has done for us, *without exception*, thus essential, or that he has made the correct knowledge and belief of these particular facts thus essential.

Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, and ye are yet in your sins." This proves that *the fact* of his resurrection is essential to salvation. But in the dialogue, in the "Her. Future Age," he is made to say, "If you maintain this (i. e. 'that there is no resurrection of the dead saints') you are in your sins." Paul does not say this. We have no authority to make the belief of any particular truth essential to salvation which the word of the Lord does not plainly declare to be so.

The writer's argument is, "that these Corinthians seem to have believed all the truths but this one truth; yet the belief of the whole is regarded as valueless, because they affirmed a proposition, which, in its logical bearing upon those truths, rendered them vain, or of no practical use."

Now, I affirm that it is not true that if a man believes all the truths of the gospel, but this one truth, of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, that his unbelief in respect to this truth, renders other truths "vain, or of no practical use," *in fact*. Whatever may be the "*logical bearing*," or the inconsistency of his unbelief respecting that truth, he is, *in fact*, influenced to penitence, to a reliance on the Son of God for salvation, and to practical holiness, by the belief of other truths, and will consequently be saved.

It is also remarked—"You (Corinthians) say you believe that Christ was raised, as I preached; but this will avail you nothing, for in saying that there is no future resurrection, you affirm a principle which overturns the fact of the resurrection of Christ, *as far as you are concerned*."

There are persons who erroneously believe the body to be the mere present tenement of the soul, which they believe is immortal. Their principle, therefore, theoretically overturns the fact of the resurrection of Christ, only so far as the resurrection of their body is concerned. The connection of the resurrection of Christ and their immortal bliss may be fully believed, notwithstanding their error concerning the dead body. To affirm that their belief in the resurrection of Christ and other important truths, will avail them nothing, is assuming the unwarrantable position that our Father in Heaven will condemn and reject the "weak in the faith," although he has commanded his church to receive them.

Such is the imperfection of the human mind that it really embraces principles which are theoretically inconsistent with each other. Therefore, I cannot admit the correctness of what the writer considers "an important truth," viz:

"A man may believe all things, but if he holds a principle which in its nature is subversive of what he believes, it is tantamount, in his case, to not believing at all."

Error in the human mind is often modified, and, in various degrees, neutralized by truth. The Calvinist believes the truth that men are blameable for their evil deeds. The Arminian says that in believing that all moral actions are decreed by the Almighty, he holds a principle which in its nature is subversive of what he believes. Now, whether the doctrine of the divine decrees of moral actions is true or false, in the mind of the Calvinist, it is not subversive of his belief of moral accountability, therefore it is not "tantamount, in his case, to not believing at all" in such accountability. The Arminian believes that God foreknows all things. The Calvinist says, that in denying the doctrine of divine decrees, in reference to moral actions, he holds a principle which in its nature is subversive of what he believes, for nothing which is uncertain can be foreknown, and nothing can be certain without decree. Be this, however, as it may, the doctrine of the divine prescience is not subverted in the mind of the Arminian by the principle that moral actions are not the subjects of decree, consequently it is not "tantamount, in his case, to not believing at all" in foreknowledge.

One more illustration. A man believes in the Lord Jesus Christ as his Saviour. He believes that his obedience unto death is the adequate foundation of the sinner's hope and eternal salva-

tion. Yet he believes that *in his highest nature as the divine Son of God*, the Saviour never died or suffered at all. Now, I affirm that he holds a principle which, *in its nature*, is subversive of what he believes; a principle which theoretically renders the means of atonement or reconciliation totally inadequate. Far be it, however, that I should affirm that this imperfection of his faith "is tantamount to his not believing" in the Saviour "at all." He has faith in the Son of God which works by love and overcomes the world.

We know that there are Christians who believe in "The Immortality of the Soul," whose minds and daily practice are influenced to holiness and the love of God and man, "by the truths they profess to believe." It is not true that by all, or even by much erroneous belief, men "place themselves in a *state of alienation* from the truth of God, by which they prevent themselves from being benefitted by the truths they profess to believe." They lose the present enjoyment and holy influence of the truths they do not believe; they may, however, believe important truths, and be benefitted by their sacred power and influence, in respect to their present holiness and comfort, and eternal salvation. HENRY GREW.

—

DR. THOMAS' REPLY TO BR. GREW.

The following points in Mr. Grew's strictures, seem to demand a little attention. In the preceding critique he says:—

1. That, in the article alluded to, Dr. Thomas consigns millions of true penitent believers on the Son of God, and followers of the Lamb, to the lake of fire, which is the second death.

2. That he confounds the importance of the existence of a fact with the importance of a correct belief in the fact.

3. That he confounds the belief of an error with the belief of every other error with which that error is logically connected, or with the denial of every truth of which that error is "logically destructive."

4. That the fact of Jesus being what he naturally is, and of his dying and rising again from the dead, are essential to the salvation of men; but a correct belief in these facts is not essential.

5. That Paul does not say, that men are in their sins, if they maintain that there is no resurrection from the dead.

6. That we have no authority to make the belief of any particular truth essential to salvation, which the word of the Lord does not plainly declare to be so.

7. That it is not true, *i. e.* Mr. Grew is of opinion that it is not true, that, if a man believes all the truths of the Gospel, but this one truth of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, that his unbelief in respect of this truth, renders other truths "vain, or of no practical use."

8. That the belief that the body is the mere present tenement of an immortal soul, is erroneous; this principle, therefore, theoretically overturns the fact of the resurrection of Christ, as far as the resurrection of *their* body is concerned. Such are "weak in the faith."

9. That God will not condemn the "weak in the faith," because he has commanded the church to receive them.

10. That error in the human mind is often modified, and, in various degrees, neutralized by truth.

11. That, to say that the *Divine* Son of God never died or suffered at all, is to hold a principle which theoretically renders the means of atonement or reconciliation totally inadequate; yet, Mr. Grew will not affirm that such a man's faith is vain.

The foregoing items seem to constitute the "pith and marrow" of our venerable friend's strictures. I shall now proceed to remark briefly upon them, one after the other, numbering my paragraphs according to the numbering of the points.

1. It does not necessarily follow, that if a man be not saved, he is therefore consigned to the lake of fire, which is the second death. *It is written*, "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world (*aion*, age or dispensation) nor in that to come"—*Matt.* xii. 32. Does not this imply that there are some offences, whether of omission or commission, that will be forgiven in the Future Age? Without discussing this point, doth not the reader see the probability of men rising from the dead, who, though not saved in the sense of *possessing the Kingdom*, may yet not be consigned to the flames of the second death. We do not affirm that it will be thus; we state the idea hypothetically, by way of illustration.

Is there no alternative to the resurrected between possessing the Kingdom and being destroyed in the lake of fire? The scriptures teach the *non-resurrection* of "millions." The Scriptures do not teach that the destiny of *mortal* men is either to be saved or burned in fire; these are not necessary alternatives. The Scriptures speak of "*times of ignorance*," and of God "*winking at*" the things done by men in such times; but they do not therefore teach that ignorant men are "blessed" and shall "inherit the Kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world." Though men boast in the present times as "the glorious and enlightened nineteenth century," the age is less enlightened *in the gospel* than was the age of the apostles. These are emphatically times of gospel ignorance; and whether God will "wink at" them as he did at the ignorant doings of the old Pagan world, I am not prepared to say; be this as it may, with the Scriptures in hand, I see no ground to believe that such "true penitent believers" as our venerable friend indicates, will ever possess the Kingdom, unless they believe the gospel concerning it; nor does it necessarily follow that they will be consigned to the lake of fire.

2. We do not make the confusion expressed in No. 2; it is our worthy friend, who doth not perceive the essentiality of a "correct belief" of important facts, to the obtaining of the Kingdom of God. Salvation is not predicated on the belief of *mere past facts*. We invite Mr. Grew's attention to this, that a man may believe all important *historical* facts concerning Jesus, but he cannot be saved, in any sense, unless he also believe the *prophetic truths* concerning the Kingdom of God. One of these truths is, that the saints shall arise bodily to "possess the Kingdom." This will come to pass whether we believe it or not. But if we deny it, or hold to that which subverts it, we theoretically overthrow the *doctrine* of the Kingdom, and therefore cut ourselves off from salvation in that Kingdom; for we are saved by the mindful belief

of that doctrine, as well as, or in connection with—inseparable connection with—belief of the important facts alluded to. A correct belief of an important fact, is not only to believe that the thing happened, but also the meaning, doctrine, or truth, affirmed in connexion with it. That Jesus rose, is a fact; that he rose for the justification of believers in the Gospel of the Kingdom, which Gospel teaches the bodily resurrection of the dead saints, is the true doctrine of that fact; to believe the fact, and to be ignorant or infidel of its doctrine, is to have no part in that resurrection, into the hope of which the enlightened believer is immersed, and of which the Son of God is the "First Fruits"

3. I do not perpetrate the confusion indicated in No. 3. One error is as fatal to a man's salvation as a multitude of errors believed; and the belief of a multitude of truths is impotent to save, if the vital truth of the whole be omitted, or denied, or if an error be held which demolishes them. "A little leaven leavens the whole lump;" therefore, beware of the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees, who say that "the soul is immortal and goes to glory at death;" for if it is so, there is no "resurrection unto life," or Kingdom of God to come. The doctrine is destroyed, and the gospel hope is gone.

4. There is a very fatal and universal error expressed in item 4. All "Christendom" supposes that belief in the "MESSENGER" is the matter of faith alone essential to salvation. Hence, "every one believes" that Jesus is the Son of God; that he died for sins and rose again. Yes, they believe after a fashion. Some piously believe; while multitudes believe in Jesus, as Turks believe in Mohammed—because every one believes in him in Turkey. But while they cry "Lord, Lord," how few believe his doctrine or obey his voice! Mankind do not believe his MESSAGE. He says he was sent to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom of God. Belief in God's Messenger alone will not save a man, no matter how pious he may be. *We must believe in his Messsenger* AND *in the Message he has sent by him, if we would be saved.* The Gospel of the Kingdom, spoken of in Daniel, and the other prophets, is the Message. "He that believes the Gospel and is baptized shall be saved." The Scripture does not say, he that believes "the Son of God is what he really is in respect to his nature, and of his doing what he really has done," and is baptized, shall be saved; it does not state this as *the* matter of faith, but the doctrine of the Kingdom and the things pertaining to the Messenger. Hence, "when the Samaritans believed Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God AND the name of the Lord Jesus, they were baptized—Acts viii. 12. Baptism, or immersion, is of no value, unless the subject believe these "things," and be brought to repentance by the belief of them. "We are renewed by *knowledge*," says Paul; ignorance is death. But alas! with Paul we may exclaim, "Who has believed *the report*?" Isaiah foresaw how few would believe the Report or Message of the Messenger of the Covenant when he should appear; and because of their unbelief in this report, Paul says a branch of Israel's olive was about to be cut off; and that, *for the same cause*, the Gentiles would be separated at the coming of the Lord. Every one believes in Jesus, but scarcely one believes in the Gospel of the Kingdom. This may be termed *the* sign that the Lord is at hand, and that the times of the Gentiles are about to close. We differ, therefore, from Mr. Grew, and maintain that a correct belief of doctrine and facts, with repentance, immersion, and holiness, are indivisibly essential to salvation in the Kingdom of God.

5. But Paul says, that the Corinthians were in their sins if they did not *keep in memory* a certain word he preached to them, which is the same thing. He preached the resurrection of the dead saints as a part of the word. Hymeneus taught that there was no future resurrection of the dead. Some believed it; of whom Paul says, "their faith was overthrown." "By grace," says he, "are ye saved *through faith*"—but if a man's faith is overthrown or shipwrecked, how can he be saved by grace through faith? A shipwrecked faith can no more save a man from death, than a shipwrecked vessel its crew from the briny deep. "We walk by faith,"—we must believe the whole truth, or we shall walk over a precipice and be dashed to atoms.

6. Granted; but the word of the Lord declares, that he that believes not the Gospel shall be damned. This Gospel is made up of "particular truths," and no one has any authority to say, that any one of them may be dispensed with. It is a "particular truth" of the Gospel, that "some who sleep in the dust of the earth shall wake to everlasting life;" it is a "particular truth" of the Gospel, that these persons "shall take the Kingdom and possess it for ever, even for ever and ever;" it is a "particular truth," that when they possess this Kingdom they "shall reign on the earth" as kings and priests; it is a "particular truth," that when this kingdom exists, they shall have "power over the nations and rule them;" it is a "particular truth" of the Gospel, that they shall rule them with Jesus for 1000 years;—these are all a few particular truths, not facts, of the Gospel, which are demolished and scattered to the four winds by the principle, or error, that the saints are not bodily raised, the direct and inevitable conclusion resulting from the absurd dogma of inherent immortal-soulism, &c. Which of these particular truths have we authority to dispense with as unnecessary to salvation? If we dispense with one, why not with all? which the world has done in fact, and yet maintains that a man may be saved! But the word of the Lord plainly declares against it.

7. Our previous remarks show, that to believe all truths but the truth of the resurrection, is not to believe "The Truth." Strike out the resurrection from "the truth," and other truths become the mere baseless fabric of a vision; or send "the soul" to glory at death, and the truth of God is rendered of none effect by the tradition.

8. This item admits the doctrine we contend for, but apologizes for the believer on account of his weakness.

9. True; God will receive the "weak in *the* faith," but not the "*weak in faith.*" It is by faith that men are able to overcome the world, the flesh, and the devil. A weak faith cannot accomplish this: it requires a strong faith to do it. A man who could not conscientiously eat meat offered to idols, though an idol was nothing, was weak in the faith, but his faith was so strong in one only living and true God, that he could have nothing to do with idols in any form without feeling defiled; and on the other hand, also, his faith was so strong in the gospel of the kingdom, &c., that

he would have gone to the stake rather than have surrendered an iota of that truth, or have apologized for faithlessness in it. No where in the Word, has the church been "commanded to receive" men who are "weak in faith;" but, on the contrary, to "rebuke them sharply that they may be *sound in the faith.*" Weak faith is the plague of this generation. The reception of such has swamped "the church," which has become faithless, disobedient, and ready to fall in the wilderness, like Israel of old. "Because of unbelief they shall not enter into my rest."

10. True. Now look on the other side:—truth in the human mind is often modified, and in various degrees *neutralized by error*, as in the case before us.

11. The Apostle John forbid the true believer to wish such a person God speed, or to show him hospitality; yet, so charitable is our venerable friend, that he will not venture to "affirm that such a man's faith is vain!"

In relation to faithlessness in one particular truth neutralizing faith in all other truths, I would cite the following example, which is indeed intimately connected with the resurrection of the saints. Paul says, "unto *them that look for Him* shall Christ appear the second time without a sin-offering *unto salvation.*" After this affirmative declaration, is it necessary for the Apostle to say negatively, that He will not come and save those who do not look for his coming, before we can venture to affirm that to believe in and look for the coming of the Lord is necessary to salvation? When a thing is affirmed, the negative is implied; but weak faith is afraid to make the implication. A man may believe all about the history of Jesus, but if he believes not in the resurrection of the dead saints, or in the coming of the Lord to salvation, "preposterous" as it may seem to our venerable friend, on the faith of the apostle's doctrine, we hesitate not to proclaim upon the house-tops, that "he cannot enter the Kingdom of God."

EDITOR OF THE HERALD OF THE FUTURE AGE.
Richmond, Va., Jan. 15th, 1848.

PROPHETIC PERIODS.—NO. V.

THE SEVEN AND SIXTY-TWO WEEKS.

Having shown that the seventy weeks bring us down to the time when Jerusalem was "compassed about with armies, when the "trangression" of Daniel's people was to be no longer "restrained," and the iniquity of that people was "filled up," we now proceed to give our opinion of the sixty-two and seven weeks of Dan. 9. We have said in a previous number that we consider this a distinct period from the 70 weeks, and not a subdivision of it. If our view of the 70 weeks is correct, it is clear the lesser period must be another, and given for another purpose, *viz: To give the time of the first advent* of "*Messiah.*" We freely admit, at the outset, that there are difficulties on this point; nor do we promise to make this topic as clear as that of the 70 weeks.

After Gabriel had given Daniel the "70 weeks npon thy people and *thy holy city*, to restrain transgression," [margin] &c., referring to events that would come within that period, he proceeds to give him another period for the coming of Messiah. Our translation reads "Know *therefore*," &c: some students of Scripture translate the original word "*also.*" Thus the Duke of Manchester, on the "Times of Daniel," reads the verse—"*Also* thou shalt know and understand from the going forth of the word to cause to return and to build Jerusalem, until Messiah the Prince [are] seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks." He remarks—"Our translators seem to have been influenced in the rendering of the verse by what they supposed must be the connexion and meaning, and they turned a mere copulative into an illative, and the future into an imperative." That is, they made an adverb, which is a mere connecting link in the discourse, to be an inference from that previously spoken. Whereas, Gabriel having given the period allotted to the further trial of Daniel's people and his holy city, next calls his attention to another measure of time which was to bring to pass an event that was to precede the final giving up of Jerusalem, the holy city, to be desolated, and trodden under foot of the Gentiles; and he says—"Know *also*," or likewise, &c.: in addition to what has been told you, understand how long it will be "*to* Messiah."

Mr. Greswell in his Dissertations, vol. 4, page 329, speaking of this prophecy, Dan. 9: 24, 25, says—"Two classes of events, which are neither the same in themselves, nor in their beginnings and their endings respectively, are connected together in the scope of its disclosures * * * * to one of these classes we may give the name of the facts of the Christian ministry, and to the other that of the facts of the Jewish war."

If then the 62 and 7 weeks are a distinct period from the 70, where did they begin? If the view we have taken in a previous number is correct, *viz.* that the decree of Cyrus [*Coresch*] is the true decree for restoring Daniel's people, and to build Jerusalem—and if we have the true date of the 70 weeks, i. e. B. C. 423, or the second year of Darius Nothus, at which time the 70 years desolation of Jerusalem ended, (see Dan. 9: 2, and Zech. 1: 7, 12, 16,) then the decree to restore (thy people) and to build Jerusalem, could not have been more than eleven years previous, or the year B. C. 434. We have in this view taken the ground that the captivity in Babylon commenced in the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar; (see 2 Kings, 24: 12.) If, however, as some suppose, the captivity commenced in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, (compare Dan. 1: 1, 2, with Jer. 25: 1,) then the 70 year captivity would terminate about twenty years prior to 423, or about 443–4 before Christ. If this last period be taken as the true date of the decree of *Coresch*, or the Scripture Cyrus, then the "7 weeks" counted as allotted to the completion of the Temple, or "46 years," (see John 2: 20,) which, though not exactly 7 prophetic weeks, yet, may be considered under the general term of 7 weeks, being 6 full weeks and 4 years into the 7th, then the 7 weeks would end about 398 B. C. Then add 62 weeks, or 434 years to that, and we have A. D. 36. If this view be correct the crucifixion could not have occurred as early as is generally supposed: but the exact year of our Lord's birth has never yet been fixed with certainty; neither has the year of his crucifixion. Different writers divide on the time of the first advent from seven years or more before the common, or vulgar era, to *eleven* years after. With this uncertainty about the birth of our Lord, it would not be strange if the crucifixion should also be found to be at a later period than has generally been supposed.

If however we should take another view of the subject, we might possibly be extricated from some of these difficulties, though we might encounter others perhaps equally as great. If we were to suppose the 62 weeks are the *whole* period given from the decree to restore, and to build Jerusalem "to Messiah;" and that the 7 weeks are only the first part of the 62, mentioned with special reference to the work to be accomplished in the first part of the 62, then we should find the 62 weeks, or 434 years, covering the entire period "to Messiah." In that case again, making the termination of the captivity *eleven* years, (as is evidently most in accordance with Scripture) before the end of the 70 years "desolations of Jerusalem," we should be brought back, for the decree of Coresch to B. C. 434, making just 62 weeks to the birth of Messiah, according to the vulgar era. Why should we not understand the language of Gabriel—"*to* Messiah the Prince," to mean to his birth, or first advent? Certainly he was proclaimed the Messiah at that time. It was revealed to old Simeon, "by the Holy Spirit, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ"—Messiah. When the old man took the child Jesus in his arms, he blessed God and declared that the promise had been fulfilled to him. When Jesus was born "the angel of the Lord" proclaimed him as the Messiah in these remarkable words, Lk. 2: 11, "Unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ (Messiah) the Lord."

Surely here is evidence strong as the "Holy Spirit" that was upon Simeon, and "the angel of the Lord," that came to the Shepherds, could make it, that "Messiah" had come; and, hence, that the specified time, given by Gabriel to Daniel, "to Messiah the Prince," was now accomplished. The expression, in Dan. 9th, "*after* three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off," does not define the exact period of that event; it may as well be 30 years after, as three years and a half after, as to any impropriety in the language.

The only difficulty in our mind to this last view of the 62 weeks is, that the language, in Dan. 9: 25, seems to indicate that the 7 weeks and the 62 are a period of 69 weeks: if this is really so, then this last view cannot be correct. But the expression "after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off," seems also to indicate, that the 62 weeks are the whole period given to bring us "*to* Messiah." And may it not be possible that the 7 weeks are the first part of the 62, specially noted, because of the work to be done in that period? If this is the case, then the decree of Coresch, B. C. 434, brings us, in 62 prophetic weeks, 434 years, exactly "to Messiah's" birth, when he was proclaimed the promised Messiah, as we have already seen. While we are satisfied that the decree of Coresch, the true Cyrus of the Scriptures, is "the commandment" spoken of by Gabriel, Dan. 9th, we are not satisfied whether that decree was issued B. C. about 444 or 434: one of those points, with present light, we believe is the true date.

We are not entirely alone in the suggestion that the 7 and 62 weeks commence at the same date. The great Joseph Mede, says:—"If we must have some limited time of forty-nine years, (7 weeks) I would date it from the same epoch as the sixty-two weeks, and make the times concurrent and not consecutive." He saw at least the possibility that these two periods might begin together.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, MARCH, 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Bible.

THE CAUSE is onward, and the truth is spreading. We have received more than three hundred new subscribers since the December number was issued. We give a few extracts of letters, in this number, to let our friends see the feeling there is abroad in reference to the Examiner and its objects. Our friends will excuse us "this once," for publishing these tokens of their satisfaction, and others will do the same for not publishing all their expressions of favour. Since our last, the friends in Millville, N. J., have established a meeting where they can worship the living God through His Son, without being subjected to sectarian lordships. In that place, eight months ago, we believe, there was not an individual that sympathized with our views on the sleep of the dead and the destruction of the wicked. Now there are two who were Methodist preachers, at that time, and many more, who being crowded out of the churches for their avowal of these truths, that meet together "in their own hired house," and utter the convictions of their own minds untrammeled. The commencement of this work was a *single* copy of the "*Six Sermons.*" Within the past two months, one hundred copies of those Sermons have been scattered, by the brethren in Millville, in that part of the State; and they have subscribed freely for the Examiner. Let all the friends, in every place, see that they do not enjoy the light alone. Make one more effort, and let that be a *continual* one, to help us on in the great work of vindicating God's truth and His blessed name from the reproach which men have heaped upon them in their hot zeal for the traditions of the Pagans, which appeared to them like jewels; and for the defence of which, they have seemed to think, like Jonah, they "do well to be angry." Most sincerely do we pity such, and earnestly desire that they may yet come to the truth, and be made "free" by it.

BE COURTEOUS.—We are sorry the Bible Advocate should be so excited with Dr. Thomas for a simple *illustration* which he used in reply to Br. Bell in the last Examiner. We hope that paper will keep cool for the time to come. We will only say, it has amazingly perverted both the Doctor's words and his meaning, and built upon that perversion a tirade of abuse ill becoming one who thinks "the Judge standeth at the door." We would like to know where the man is that has no error in his theory? Let him cast the first stone at his brother who differs from him. We certainly differ from Dr. Thomas

in several things: and we equally differ with the Advocate. If we believed to constitute a man a real Christian, he must be perfect in knowledge and judgment, we should never hope to find a Christian on earth, till the next age shall come. If men are sincerely inquiring after truth, and using the best light they have, and do fall into some error, they are no more blame-worthy than they would be for having a fever, or breaking their bones, or being destitute of daily food. We might just as well fall into a passion with our fellow-men for suffering with hunger, being sick, or breaking their bones, as to get out of humor with them for their errors in doctrine, if they manifest the spirit of Christ in their lives, and are using their best endeavours to inform themselves as to what is truth. To be sick, or to be in error, are both misfortunes, and both cause loss and pain to a greater or less extent. The subject of these calamities is to be pitied not abused. We would think him a tiger that would fall upon a man with a broken bone and abuse him. Surely error is worse to the individual than broken bones; and we all have more or less; let us never forget that. Least of all has the Advocate occasion to complain of Dr. Thomas' "absurdities" while it maintains that the "millennium *is past*," and that it covered the darkest ages of Papacy!!

The Advocate, and some others who get "impatient," "dream" dreams, and "interpret" them, in our zeal for "the cause," may possibly be benefited by the following story:

"When Bulstrode Whitelocke was embarking as Cromwell's envoy to Sweden, in 1653, he was much disturbed in mind as he rested in Harwich on the preceding night, which was very stormy, while he reflected on the distracted state of the nation. It happened that a confidential servant slept in an adjacent bed, who, finding that his master could not sleep, at length said, "Pray, Sir, will you give me leave to ask you a question?" "Certainly." "Pray, Sir, don't you think that God governed the world very well before you came into it?" "Undoubtedly" "And pray, Sir, don't you think he will govern it quite as well when you are gone out of it?" "Certainly." "Then, Sir, pray excuse me, but don't you think you may trust him to govern it quite as well as long as you live?" To this question Whitelocke had nothing to reply; but turning himself about, soon fell fast asleep till he was summoned to embark."

TENDENCIES OF IMMORTAL SOULISM.

In the "Mysteries of Romanism," exhibiting the "Demoralizing Influences of Popery," we find a Chapter on "The Tendencies of Romish Literature," one paragraph of which is the following:—

"Among the late perverts to Rome of high degree we find chronicled the name of *Lady Georgiana Fullerton*, sister to Lord Grenville, and authoress of "Ellen Middleton." After reading this exciting novel, and observing the peculiar cast of thought and train of remark when adverting to religious exercises and duties, we were not surprised to learn that our authoress had become a full convert to superstition, and at last entered the mystical precincts of Rome. When we see Alice bowing in her closet before a picture of our Saviour, and then holding up the crucifix before the eyes of her dying husband; when we see what sacredness, awe, and efficacy, are attributed to the act of confession to a priest; when we hear Mrs. Tracy, heretofore the deadly enemy of Ellen Middleton, kneeling at her bed side, in hardly articulate tones saying to her, '*Pray for me when you are in heaven;*' finally, when we hear Ellen's speech to her husband, in which she says: 'There is a blessed communion in which we both believe, between those who rest in heaven, and those who struggle on earth; you will pray for me when I am gone; and I will pray for you where I go:' who can doubt that the writer's mind was already enslaved to Romanism?"

And cannot this Protestant Editor, "Rev. C. Sparry," see, and "*who can doubt*, that the" immortal soul theory was what led Lady Fullerton straight down the gulph to Romanism; where thousands and tens of thousands more have gone and are going? Had Lady Fullerton fully believed the bible truth, "the dead praise not the Lord"—"the dead know not anything," does the "Rev. Editor," himself, believe she would have found an open door into "Romanism?" She honestly followed out the immortal soul theory. Its legitimate landing place is Romanism or Restorationism. Lady Fullerton landed in the former, and Bishop Newton in the latter. Will Mr. Sparry, or any one else, show us, if they can, the impropriety of asking a dying saint to "pray for" us when they "get to heaven"—or, for that dying saint to say "I will pray for you where I go," on the supposition that the dead do know "more than all the world," and are alive in the presence of God? Are they less holy there than while here? Are they less interested for friends left behind when they get to heaven than while they were with them on earth? Have they less access to God there than here? If it is answered—"Christ is the intercessor there"—We answer—He is no more the intercessor after saints die than before; and we are commanded to pray for one another, and we know of no Protestant that hesitates to ask a Christian to pray for him. Paul himself said—"Brethren, pray for me." It may be said—"True; we should pray for each other while here." We reply—Paul said, "I will that men pray *everywhere*." It may be said again,—"Paul did not mean when they were dead." He said, "EVERYWHERE;" and from that obligation it is for our opponents to show they are released by death, unless they are *unconscious*, and therefore incapable of the act. But the objector may say, "We have no Scripture example of living saints asking dying ones to pray for them when they get to heaven." We answer—"Thou hast said truly:" and the reason is obvious—the Bible saints understood that there is *no knowledge* in *sheol*, the invisible state, where their dying friends

were going; their hope, their *one and only hope* was in the resurrection; the pagan fable had not obtained among them, that the soul is immortal: they understood their friends were "silent in the grave." But when the heathen superstition of "disembodied spirits"—"the soul immortal"—"the dead know more than all the world," stole into the church, then her communicants, who embraced this "vain philosophy," were fully prepared to slide into praying to saints—from that to a purgatory—and then into "Romanism" fully developed, or the "man of sin" large as life. No wonder Protestants have made so poor a stand against Romanism. Ever since Luther, by the persuasion of his brother Reformers, was tempted, and fell by the temptation, and gave up, or consented to hide his light on the subject of the *non*-immortality of the soul, Romanism has marched onward and "prevailed," and will prevail till the doctrine of man's natural, or inherent immortality is once more firmly placed where Luther placed it at the commencement of the reformation, among the "Roman *dunghill of decretals.*" It has no higher authority. The council of Lateran, under Pope Leo X. passed the following "Canon:"—

"Some have *dared* to assert concerning the nature of the reasonable soul, that it is mortal; *we* with the approbation of the *sacred council*, do *condemn and reprobate all such*, seeing, *according to the canon of Pope Clement the Fifth, that the soul is immortal:* and we strictly inhibit all from dogmatising otherwise: and we decree, that all who adhere to the like erroneous assertions, shall be shunned and punished as heretics."—*Caranza*, page 412—1681.

This canon shows that the doctrine of an "immortal soul," that lives when the man is *dead*, was supported in those days, as it generally has been since, by the authority of Creeds, rather than by the truth of God. Bishop Tilliston says, in his Sermon, Vol. 2, printed 1774, "*The immortality of the soul is rather supposed, or taken for granted, than expressly revealed in the Bible.*"

Do we not well say then—The tendencies of the immortal soul theory, is to lead men to reverence the creeds of men more than the Bible—their declaration of sentiments—their priestly domination, and hence directly forward into Romanism? The author of the work, "Mysteries of Romanism," tells us, p. 23:

"A court-lady, daughter of the Earl of Devonshire, having embraced the catholic religion, (in the reign of Charles I.) was asked by Laud the reason of her conversion. 'It is chiefly,' said she, 'because I hate to travel in a crowd.' Being desired to explain her meaning, she replied: 'I perceive your grace, (Laud) and many others are *making haste to Rome*, and therefore, in order to prevent being crowded, I have gone before you."

Multitudes of Protestants, in England and elsewhere, have gone to the Romish religion, because the Reformers did not maintain the principle of Luther when he first saw clearly the light, that the doctrine of an inherent immortal soul was only a "Roman dunghill decretal:" and multitudes more, in this country, will land there, if this age continues much longer, some of whom make great displays of zeal against her at present. The reason is, they hold substantially with Rome in her pagan fable of the consciousness of dead men.

WOULD YOU INHERIT THE KINGDOM?

Math. 6: 33. "*Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.*"

To understand this text we must view it with its connection. Our Lord had assured his followers "No man can serve two masters—Ye cannot serve God and mammon:" or, ye cannot serve God and a mind bent on the things of this world—such as riches, &c. "Therefore, I say unto you, take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for the body what ye shall put on." This verse and the following have been amazingly perverted by some minds, by not considering that it is common in Scripture to speak of a thing of less importance than another as if it were of no importance. Many examples of this may be given. Our Saviour said, Luke 14: 26, "If a man *hate not* his—wife—and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." How are we to understand such an expression? By no means in an absolute sense. The apostles are the best commentators on the meaning of our Lord's words that we can have. Do they countenance the absolute sense of these words? See Eph. 5: 25, 28, "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it." "So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself." And in the 29th verse the apostle says,—"No man ever yet hated his own flesh," or himself—his "life." The thing, in an absolute sense, is impossible. Again, our Lord, John 6: 27, says, "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life." This is a text of the same character as the other; not to be explained so as to contradict inspired expositions of man's duty as to the things of this life. When man was placed in Eden, and in innocency, he was placed there "to dress and to keep it." Paul to Timothy, 1 Tim. 5: 8. says—"But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." And again, 2 Thes. 3: 10—12, he says—"For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busy-bodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread."

With such a commentary on our Lord's words, we cannot be in doubt as to their meaning; and as we before said, he spoke in accordance with the custom of those days, in which, things of less value when placed by the side of those immensely more valuable are spoken of as of no value—to be hated—not to be regarded; that is, comparatively speaking. So the words "take no thought," &c., we are not to understand in an absolute sense. Paul

did not so understand them, when a prisoner at Rome; and at a time, too, when he declares "I have finished my course—I am ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand." In the same chapter, immediately after, he tells Timothy—"The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments." Pray, Paul are you not taking "thought what you shall put on"? Why think about that "*cloak*," when you are just going "to be offered"? Paul cannot help thinking he shall want that cloak to keep him warm while here. He had learned, it is true, in whatsoever state he was to be content, but not so content as not to use lawful means to make his condition more comfortable when in his power. So when our Lord says, take no thought, he only prohibits such thought as is implied in *serving mammon*—such thought as rules and absorbs the mind to the exclusion of the service of God, the superior and most important of all thoughts and service; or such thought as implies distrust of God's fatherly care over us while we make his service the great, grand and absorbing business of life. We may paraphrase the verse and connexion thus: "You cannot have a mind devoted to God, and at the same time bent upon and absorbed by the riches of this world; therefore I say unto you, be not anxiously careful for your life about food and raiment, lest you serve mammon, and make a treasure laid up on earth your portion, and thus depart from God. To guard you against this anxious care consider the fowls of the air, though they lay up no stores, yet your heavenly Father feedeth them," &c. "Therefore be not anxiously careful, saying—What shall we eat? or What shall we drink? or Wherewithal shall we be clothed, (for the Gentiles, who know not God, make these things the all absorbing objects of their pursuit) and your heavenly Father knoweth that *ye have need* of these things; therefore, seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, or that righteousness which he requires, and all these things shall be added unto you, while diligent in business, but without distracting thoughts; take therefore no distracting thoughts about the future: the future, if it comes, will bring its own cares, but you should not anticipate them, and burden your minds by adding them to those of the present time; sufficient unto the day is the evil it brings." Such, we believe, is the true sense and meaning of our Lord's discourse. And he calls our minds to the immense value of an inheritance in the kingdom of God, in comparison of which, food, raiment, and life itself, are of no value.

God has a kingdom to be established. It is called "the kingdom of God;" and this by way of distinction from all the kingdoms that have gone before it. The kingdoms, or reigning governments of this world are emblematically set forth as dreadful beasts; savage, oppressive, warlike, and doomed to destruction: but another is to succeed them entirely dissimilar; mild, equitable, peaceable, and everlasting. We are required to pray—"Thy kingdom come." We are bound to pray understandingly: not to do so is to mock God. How can we pray understandingly for that of which we are in ignorance? How can such a prayer be sincerely offered? If we know not what it is we are praying for, how can we desire it? If there is no desire for that we pray for, our prayer is hypocrisy. Paul tells us, 1 Corth. 14: 15, "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also." We may safely say—All prayer must be thus offered if acceptable to God. If so, then it is essential that we have knowledge in regard to the location and nature of the kingdom of God, else we do not pray with the understanding. These remarks are equally applicable in view of the command to seek first the kingdom; or, make it the first object of our attention. How can we seek it at all, if we are ignorant of its nature and location? How can the injunction have any weight with us, if we know not what it is we are to seek, or where it is to be found? It is vastly more important than most professed Christians suppose that we have clear and distinct ideas about this kingdom, if we would not pray about it hypocritically, and seek for it as one that beateth the air. Let us then inform ourselves on these matters.

1. *Its Location:* The prayer our Saviour taught us states distinctly where we are to expect the kingdom of God to be established. "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done *on earth*," &c. It is on earth we are to pray for this kingdom to be established, or set up. Daniel, also saw in vision, chap. 7, "one like the Son of man" have "given him dominion and glory, and *a kingdom;*" and "all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." And the explanation of that vision shows that "The kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom *under the whole heaven*" is that to be possessed by the saints, including Christ, the first and chief of the saints, or holy ones. Our Saviour also declares—"The meek shall inherit *the earth*:" thus settling the point, that the kingdom of God is to be on earth.

2. *Its Nature:* Its King is immortal—he can die no more; "death hath no more dominion over him." He will reign personally and visibly. "This *same Jesus*, that is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven:" Acts 1: 11, "The Lord *himself* shall descend from heaven," &c. 1 Thes. 4: 16. Also Jer. 23: 5, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." These texts are a sample of many that go to show that the King is personally and visibly to reign, and to do so "on earth." The saints, those "that are Christ's at his coming" to establish his kingdom or set it up, whether they are asleep or awake, *i. e.* dead or alive, "will sit down with" Christ on his "throne," or become Rulers with him, as heirs through him, in the kingdom. It is common with the men of the present age, after political campaigns, to promote their friends, who have laboured, suffered, and expended funds in their cause; and they do it by bestowing profitable and honourable offices upon them. The King of kings, when he takes the kingdom, will, according to his covenant engagement, bestow a crown upon every one, who has faithfully adhered to his cause, while his enemies have had the kingdoms of the world in their possession. That will be the reward of immortality, or to have their vile bodies changed and fashioned like their King's most glorious body; and, with him, to be established as Rulers in the Everlasting Kingdom. This kingdom will be the same throughout the endless succession of ages; but it will undergo various modifications, each age rising higher in glory than the preceding. The

next, or coming age, which commences this kingdom on earth, will be a *mixture:* that is, The *rulers* of that age, or thousand years, called the millenium, will all be immortal: the *subjects*, or those "left" from the overwhelming judgments upon the earth, with which that age will be ushered in, will be liable to corruption with their posterity who will be born during that age: and though the nations will be subjected to Christ and his "Joint Heirs," during the thousand years, or whatever the length of that age may be, so that no national demonstration of hostility to the government of Christ will be made, yet when that age closes a mighty combined effort will be made to overthrow His Government, but it will be signally and totally defeated; and, probably will be the last demonstration of hostility ever made to Christ's reign. Having now briefly noticed the nature of the Kingdom of God, we proceed to some remarks on the injunction to "*seek first*" this kingdom, and "His righteousness." The term "*first*" often signifies, "*chief*." If so in the text before us, then we are commanded to make this object the *principal* concern of our life; it is to stand out in our minds as *the* great business for which we now live: it is to have a prominence in our affections and actions, that no other is entitled to. But, how can this be the case so long as there is no definite idea in our minds as to the nature and location of this kingdom? Without this, how can the mind be made to realize its value so as to give it that attention for which the demand is made? How can we obtain the knowledge necessary to give such importance to the subject as shall lead us to obedience to the command to make that kingdom the first, or chief object of our pursuit? To secure this end, must there not be somewhere a *description* of the Kingdom of God? Where can we find that description if not in the Bible? It certainly is not contained in the fancies of men, nor the creeds they have invented. If it is described in the Bible, how shall we learn what it is unless we "Search the Scriptures?" How then can any man be said to be seeking that kingdom who neglects this examination, and makes it not the most anxious study of his life? It is not *reveries*, or a few flights of fancy, that makes a man an understanding seeker of the kingdom of God. We must serve God *in truth*, as well as in spirit, or we "beat the air." Let us, then, most earnestly and prayerfully seek this kingdom by a careful study of the words of God, as spoken to us by the Holy Spirit through holy men of old.

To be Heirs of the Kingdom of God we must not only seek the kingdom but "His righteousness;" that is—The righteousness which God requires. Not some fancied, undescribable, and undefinable operation unknown except to a diseased imagination, but that holiness, or purity of mind and life, taught by Patriarchs and Prophets, but especially brought to view in the teachings of him who "spake as never man spake;" and who exemplified it in his life, so that he became the living embodiment of all he taught; and left us in no doubt as to what constitutes holiness, or what that righteousness is which God requires to prepare us to be "joint heirs with Christ" in the Kingdom of God. It is "the righteousness of faith;" or, that righteousness which is produced by a believing reception of the Son of God, and a constant contemplation of his *holy life, conversation, and tempers;* which by "beholding we are changed into the same image, from glory to glory," or honour, "even as by the Spirit of the Lord;" which Spirit works by the *truth* of God, that being its "sword," and the *instrument* of sanctification—"Sanctify them through thy truth—*thy word* is truth." Christ as we have said, was the living embodiment of the truths he taught, and left us an "example" that we should "walk even as he walked:" 1 John 2: 6, and 1 Peter 2: 21. Let us then, carefully look at him—*his humility—his patience—his forgiving disposition—his resignation—his love of enemies—his love to God—his hatred of sin—especially, his spirit and practice of obedience;* so that he could say "*I delight to do thy will, O God.*" Here is a lesson for us to learn. Whoever lays it to mind, and believes it essential that he should learn this lesson, in order to an inheritance in the Kingdom of God, will see the propriety and importance of making it his "first" and principal, or chief object. It is not learned in a day; though we may form the resolution at once to commence the work, and make a beginning; but we shall find that the longest life is none too long to accomplish a work of such magnitude and importance. The doctrine and commandments of men have set up a lower standard, even that of fallible men, whose memoirs are sought and read as the standard of all their attainments. Whatever value there may be in such memoirs, they are worthless, if not pernicious, when compared with that standard given us by the Son of God.

Let us then, set the Lord Jesus before our minds for constant contemplation. If we find ourselves coming short let us not faint nor be discouraged, but renew our effort depending upon the aid of that Spirit which our Lord promised before he went away, and which he assured his followers our heavenly Father is more ready to give to them that ask him than we are to give good gifts to our children. Our Lord and Master watches over us, not to find occasion against us; but, to "help our infirmities." Thus, if we find we come short, we are to increase our "diligence" that we may grow up into the likeness of Christ, even "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ;" and thus "grow up into him in all things, who is the head:" Eph. 4: 13—15.

The Kingdom of God lies before us: we are called to give it our highest attention and efforts. Consider its value—its glory—its high privileges—its exalted honours—its endless durability. Consider, it was that which filled the Saviour's heart—"the joy set before him"—the Kingdom of God, where he would sit with his followers on the throne of his glory. It was that which occupied the minds of Patriarchs—Prophets—Apostles, and all the faithful martyrs. Shall we then neglect it? Shall we not heed the command of our Lord, who is soon to return to earth, and establish this kingdom? Where are our sympathies? Are they with the "kingdoms of this world;" or, with the "Kingdom of our God and his Christ"? And let us remember—"*The unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.*"

BISHOP NEWTON—ETERNAL TORMENTS.

The following extracts are from the *Sixth* Vol. of Bishop Newton's Works, London Edition, 1787, and show the inextricable dilemma into which a powerful mind was plunged by the belief of man's natural immortality. We believe that nearly all

immortal-soul theorists are, though unconscious of it themselves, Restorationists. The Bishop's topic, in "*Disertation*" No. 60 is—"*On the final state and condition of man.*" He is really a very great "*heretic.*" "*Hell,*" he says, "as a place of torment, is no where mentioned in the writings of Moses," &c. He then goes on to tell us that—

"GEHENNA is the more usual name for the place of torment, and better known among the Jews; but the origin of this name is of a later date. Gehenna, or the valley of Hinnom, the name of the old proprietor of the land, was a place in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, where the worshippers of Moloch offered and burnt in the fire their sons and daughters to that grim idol; and that part, where these sacrifices were made, was called TOPHET, from TOPH, a drum, drums and such like noisy instruments being employed to drown the cries of these miserable children. The good king Josiah defiled the place, cut down the groves, brake down the images and altars, and filled it with dead men's bones, the bones of the priests who sacrificed there, and henceforth it became a kind of common sewer, where all the carrion, garbage and offals of the city were thrown, and to prevent any infection a fire was kept continually burning to consume them. This valley was further signalized by two memorable occurrences before and after this time. For here it was that Sennacherib, the king of Assyria's army, consisting of 185,000 men, were all slain in one night, and their bodies consumed by fire, according to the prophecy of Isaiah 30: 31, 33, 'For through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down, which smote with a rod. . . . For Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared; he hath made it deep and large: the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it.' Here also was a great slaughter and massacre of the idolatrous Jews by the Babylonians, and their carcases, more than could be buried, were left a prey to the birds of the air, and the beasts of the field, according to the prediction of Jeremiah 7: 31—33, 'And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter: for they shall bury in Tophet, till there be no place. And the carcases of this people shall be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth; and none shall fray them away.' Such a horrid place as this, so deservedly execrated both by God and man, the stage of such destruction, the scene of such continual burning, was fitly considered by the Jews as a type and figure of hell-fire, and the name is adopted and repeated several times by our Saviour himself in the gospels. One other name is used in the Scripture for the place of torment, THE LAKE OF FIRE AND BRIMSTONE, which is a manifest allusion to the lake Asphaltites, where Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities of the plain were overthrown by brimstone and fire from heaven, and as St. Jude saith. 5: 7, 'are set forth as an ensample suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.' For men have no other way of expressing the invisible things of a future state but by some sensible objects, such as they have seen or known, or been accustomed to in this world."

"We cannot in the least discover, in what part of infinite space will be the mansions of just men made perfect. Neither can we learn with any more certainty which is the place of hell. Some have imagined, that the fire at the centre of the earth is the fire of hell: but it hath never been proved that there is any such central fire: it contradicts all our notions of philosophy. If there be any such fire, it may be prepared ready for the general conflagration; but after the general conflagration we are assured, there will be a 'new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness,' and consequently there can be no such place as hell. Others have conceived that a comet, and others again that the sun will be the place of hell. There the fire is already kindled; but the Lord of the universe can easily kindle any star or planet, that it shall immediately become a furnace of fire for the punishment of rebellious creatures against their Creator."

Such endless conjectures are men, great men, led into, who depart from the plain Scripture testimony, that "the righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner;*" and that the portion of the sinner is to be burned "*up root and branch;*" &c. But Bishop Newton had adopted the *Pagan philosophy* that the soul is immortal; which, as Martin Luther once said, is among the "*monstrous opinions* to be found in the Roman *dunghill* of decretals." *Defence*, prop. 27, published 1530.

The Bishop next speaks of the *duration* and different *degrees* of rewards and punishments. As to the *nature* of these things he follows exactly in the so called "orthodox" strain of reasoning—dwelling upon the same texts on which they rely, and states his opinion that "the *fire of hell* is not metaphorical but real." After having dwelt upon the different degrees of bliss and misery, he says:—

"But the greatest difficulty of all yet remains to be considered, which is the duration of the happiness of the blessed, and of the misery of the damned. Mat. 25: 46, 'And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: and the righteous into life eternal.' That the righteous should be rewarded with everlasting happiness is readily admitted; it is what every one wishes, and what every one therefore easily believes: but that the wicked should be punished with ETERNAL MISERY, is of a harder digestion; it is not perhaps for men's interest that it should be true, and therefore they are willing to hope and believe that it may be false. And this article, I believe, hath not only stuck with infidels, but hath also raised scruples in the minds of many serious Christians For indeed *it is one of the most knotty points of divinity, and the hardest to be reconciled to our reason.* Some assert in the strongest terms the eternity of hell-torments, others as peremptorily deny it, but for my part, I cannot entirely approve either the arguments usually urged in support of this doctrine, or the objections usually made against it. The truth may possibly lie in the mid-way between both," &c.

The Bishop then examines the subject, and attempts to disprove the doctrine of "annihilation." After quoting the usual texts to prove the doctrine

of the eternal torments of the wicked; he says:—"But the words 'everlasting,' 'eternal,' 'forever,' and the like are sometimes used in a limited sense, and do not always signify an endless duration; and therefore though the punishment of the wicked be called 'everlasting,' 'eternal,' yet may it not for all that be of endless duration. . . When Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them are spoken of, by Jude, as suffering the vengeance of ETERNAL FIRE; the fire continued no longer than till it had reduced them to utter destruction. The sense therefore is limited by the nature of the thing: but when the nature of the thing doth not limit and restrain it, the words should certainly be taken in their proper and genuine signification. . . . . It must be admitted that God has threatened everlasting misery to the wicked as plainly and positively as he hath promised everlasting happiness to the righteous. . . . . You cannot complain of injustice, for the rewards and punishments are equal: and it was really necessary that the rewards and punishments should be declared EVERLASTING. . . . You cannot then complain that the sanction of eternal penalties is unreasonable, for you see plainly that it is no more than is absolutely necessary; but possibly you may think, though it may be necessary in the government of this world for such things to be denounced by God and believed by men, yet there may not be the like necessity for inflicting them in the world to come. God is not obliged to execute his threatenings, as he is to make good his promises. But why is he not obliged to perform the one as well as the other? . . . . If God will not execute as well as threaten, why does he threaten at all? . . . There is then sufficient reason to conclude that God will fully execute his threatenings as well as make good his promises, and the rewards and punishments consequent thereupon will be REALLY AND TRULY EVERLASTING; . . . . and as long as they retain the same qualities, so long they will keep the same station; as long as they remain righteous or wicked, so long they will remain happy or miserable even to all eternity."

The Bishop then proceeds with a long and laboured argument to show that it is *possible* for the righteous in heaven to "commit iniquity," and asks, if "he should still continue in glory?" So "if the wicked *should* turn away from his wickedness" he "should be plucked as a fire-brand out of the fire." And the Bishop adds—"This I conceive is the true notion and representation of the eternity of rewards and punishments." After labouring to show that such changes may take place in the world to come, he adds:—

"Repentance, therefore, is not impossible in hell; but yet you may ask—What reason is there to think it possible? and I answer—Because IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR ANY CREATURE TO LIVE IN ETERNAL TORMENTS. Who among us can dwell with the devouring fire? who among us can dwell with everlasting burnings. . . . . Nothing can be more contrary to the divine nature and attributes, than for a God all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, all-perfect, to bestow existence on any beings, whose destiny, he foresees and foreknows, must terminate in wretchedness and misery, without recovery or remedy, without respite or end. . . 'God is love;' and he would rather have not given life, than render that life a torment and curse to all eternity. . . . Imagine a creature, nay, imagine numberless creatures produced out of nothing . . . delivered over to torments of endless ages, without the least hope or possibility of relaxation or redemption. IMAGINE IT YOU MAY, BUT YOU CAN NEVER SERIOUSLY BELIEVE IT, nor reconcile it to God and goodness. . . . God . . could never make any [creature] whose end he foreknew would be misery everlasting. . . . The LETTER of Scripture may indeed sound forth everlasting punishments, but the SPIRIT of Scripture intimates the contrary. . . . . The Lord proclaims himself, Exodus 34: 6, 7, 'The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin;' but how can such attributes consist with a system of irrecoverable vengeance for thousands, transgressions never to be forgiven, and torments never to have an end?"

Thus Bishop Newton was driven into the doctrine of the final restoration of all men and devils, as the remainder of the article shows, from which we have made these few extracts. How came he plunged into Restorationism? Because he set out with the false theory that all men and devils are immortal, or have eternal conscious being: there was the foundation of his error. He has proved, in the first part of his article, conclusively, that the punishment of the wicked is eternal; he then has, virtually, to deny his own position on that point, as well as deny the plain Scripture testimony of the endless duration of the sinner's punishment: and why all this? Because he adopts the Pagan and Papistical notion of "immortal souls," and makes the punishment of the wicked to consist in *torment* instead of *Death*, as the Scriptures affirm; for, "*The wages of sin is death*:"—and that death is *everlasting, eternal, for ever and ever*—no recovery—no *restoration*. The Bishop, to establish his point, has placed the righteous in a position that they may fall from glory, and thus come under the power of death, in direct contradiction of our Lord's plain words, that they who are accounted worthy to attain that world and the resurrection from the dead, can *die no more*. Luke 20: 35, 36. All this is the *fruit* of the common theory of endless being in undescribable torments. Man has no immortality *in himself*. Out of Christ he is *dying*: and he finally dies the *second death*, because he would not come to Christ that he might have life: he is consumed like the "fat of lambs; into smoke shall he consume away." See Psalms 37: 20. How long will men preach heathen philosophy and popish superstitions, instead of the plain testimony of the God of truth? They will do it till they cast off the traditions of men, and lay aside their "*Standard Authors*," which they are now *deifying*, and trust *alone* in the Lord's Truth and Spirit to guide them. When they thus honour God, they may expect that he will honour them. But while they trust in man, they are "cursed" with blindness. Bishop Newton's entire article shows a powerful mind, in a mighty struggle to extricate itself from a dilemma into which it had been cast by adopting the notion that the soul out of Christ is immortal. He cannot deny but that the "*letter* of the Scriptures" plainly "*declares*" the sinner's punishment to be *eternal*; but *then*, having fixed upon a false theory as to what that punishment is, viz: eternal *torments*, he starts back

with "the *spirit* of the Scriptures intimates the contrary." Thus setting the "letter" and "the spirit" of the Bible at war with themselves. It is true, that while the Scriptures plainly declare that the punishment of the sinner is *eternal*, both the letter and the spirit of that blessed volume agree that the punishment of the sinner is *not endless torment, in conscious being*, but DEATH. To this fact there is the most perfect harmony and agreement throughout the book of God. By not perceiving this truth, the great mind of the Bishop was swamped in confused and unscriptural notions of Restorationism. He had, however, more courage than many modern ministers of the gospel, who lean strongly towards that doctrine, but have not courage enough to avow the workings of their own minds, lest it should make them unpopular. We do know that some of the ministers of the present age, in the "orthodox" churches, are at heart Restorationists, but dare not own it, and, perhaps, denounce us for believing that "*all the wicked will God destroy.*" They have been driven and chafed in their minds by Universalists and Restorationists, till they no longer preach eternal torments in the strains they used to do, and are leaving their flocks to slide into Restorationism by insensible degrees, so that the "orthodox" churches are fast filling up with *real* infidelity, while their pastors occasionally denounce the true doctrine of the end of the wicked as "Destructionism" or "Annihilationism." Let them cry out still, if they will, or sleep, lie down, and love to slumber; the Judge of men will soon show by what principle we have all been actuated; and then shall every man receive according to his deeds—"To them who by patient continuance in well doing, SEEK FOR glory, and honour, and *immortality*, eternal life." But, if we have been ashamed of Christ, or *his words*, he will be ashamed of us in the day of his coming in his own glory and the glory of his Father, with the holy angels—then shall such "be *punished* with EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION *from* the presence of the Lord," &c.

Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, affirms that, "at the time of Judgment, those *souls* that appear worthy of God, die no more, but the rest shall be punished as long as God shall please to continue their *existence*, and their punishment." This passage Bishop Newton quotes, as favouring his views of Restorationism. But, if he quotes the language correctly, it appears clearly to favour the idea of the final *non*-"existance" of the souls who are found wicked; but, whether it does or not, the Bible positively declares, "THE SOUL THAT SINNETH IT SHALL DIE." Ezek. 18: 4, 20.

LETTERS.

THE COMMENDATION WE LIKE: Br. H. C. Hutman writes.: "HARRISBURGH, Pa: It is impressed on my mind, the most forcible manner of expressing my favourable opinion of your Bible Examiner, would be by forwarding new subscribers, with the money for the same. I therefore take pleasure in telling you that by asking * * * * this morning, they requested me to write you to send them a copy, commencing No. 1, Vol. 3."

Just let all our friends go and do likewise. If you get your Examiner worn out in showing it, we will send you another in its place.

BR. R. T. HARMAN writes:—

BAINBRIDGE, Pa.

BR. STORRS:—I must say, that I take much pleasure in reading your paper. The reason of it is, that it advocates the doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead, and end of the wicked. And to me there appears to be such a glory connected with those doctrines that it illumines the sacred page, and enables me to see from the word of God the whole plan of His dealings with His creatures from the time Adam was placed in the garden of Eden, down to the setting up of the kingdom of God. Adam lost his life by transgression; Christ came to ransom. All, therefore, who come unto Him shall have eternal life, and dwell in the kingdom of God forever; and those who refuse to come to Christ for life must die the second death, and "be no more,"—"be as though they had not been." How simple, how clear, how plain that view makes the Word of God. Before I embraced this view, the whole plan of salvation seemed dark and mysterious, but now it appears plain, clear, and glorious.

BR. RANSOM HICKS writes:—

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

BRO. STORRS:—The "Bible Examiner" is gladly received by me. It is truly a welcome messenger indeed. And not to me only, but to others in the vicinity who also receive it. Go on—declare the whole council of God; and especially that portion which some intimate as being of minor importance, non-essential, &c., viz: "The dead know not anything—All the wicked will God destroy,"—They shall be "burned up root and branch." "They shall be (not annihilated) but ashes under the soles of their feet who fear God's name."

Men who will not acknowledge their errors, but choose rather to cloak them, must always expect to be in error.

Thirty copies of the Examiner, for one year, are paid for by Br. Hicks. That is right, brethren, help us scatter the light.

BR. R. E. LADD writes:—

CABOTVILLE, Mass.

BROTHER STORRS:—Set me down for twenty copies of the Examiner. I admire it more and more. It is just what is wanted, and it will be more and more appreciated by the candid and honest minded advent believers, as one after another of their props give way under them. "Timeists" must have their race—Spiritualists must come to the *truth*, or go into actual fanaticism—"Endless misery" believers must embrace Universalism, Infidelity, or the "word of the Lord," on that subject. I shall labour, pray and preach, as far as in me lies, for the spread of the truth on these subjects, and the Examiner is exactly suited to this end. God bless you and our beloved Br. Walsh, whose writings have proved a great blessing to me, in your labours of love, so thankless to the mass of the professors of the religion of the cross.

BR. W. G. PROCTOR writes:—

RAYS HILL, Pa.

Let me express an idea that I have long entertained, viz: that every truth to be believed, as necessary to salvation, is expressed in the Bible; so that it is unnecessary to coin words to express our views—and furthermore, it is dangerous to do so, for often the language applied is absurd and contradictory. I am happy to inform you, that, by the presentation of plain Bible truth, we are changing the state of things faster than we expected; for those who have, and who still continue to oppose us, are becoming more particular in their public communications. We have even succeeded in changing their manner of prayer, and instead of an immediate transition from earth to Heaven, their expressions intimate a hope in the resurrection. "Immortal, never dying soul" is seldom used in prayer, or otherwise; and the reason is, we have been bold in calling for their proofs, which has wakened up a spirit of investigation, and the community begin to see that much has been proclaimed for Bible truth that is not in the good book, and so they begin to require the Bible proof for what their clergy present for belief. If the love of party and popularity could be lessened, and moral honesty increased, we could be certain to succeed beyond all precedent.

—

THOS. P. HEDRICK writes:

LAUREL, Indiana.

BRO. STORRS—I take pleasure in sending you the names of new subscribers to the Examiner. Your paper is certainly calculated to do good, if the presentation of truth can affect it. What is truth if it is not presented in the word of the Lord, which all Christians agree is contained in the Bible? Now, can any child of God believe for one moment, or can they entertain the thought, that in speaking to us he would use duplicity? And is it not *deceit* to make a revelation, in which the mind or purposes of the speaker does not appear in the language employed? Would not all pronounce such a course, "*hypocrisy?*" And yet how many good meaning Christians thus charge *God* foolishly every day. When God declares the sinner shall die (lose life) if he continues to sin, they declare he shall not die, but live, and drag out a miserable existence forever;—and "yet a little while and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be;" they reply, he shall always be, and his place shall always be in hell. When pressed with the question, whether a thing can exist and not fill space, occupy place, &c., the reply is—That means on the earth. I am thankful that I have been differently instructed. I wish to do all in my power to disseminate the light; but how many there are that prefer darkness rather than light.

Three "*once*" Methodist preachers, in this neighbourhood, are now sent out of the Lord to proclaim the sleep of the dead, and that "all the wicked will God destroy."

—

BR. N. M. CATLIN writes:

LA PORTE, Ind.

BR. STORRS:—You have some warm friends in this section, who feel a deep interest in your "Bible Examiner," and your own welfare. Having had a knowledge of your trials from the time of No. 1, Bible Examiner, old series, to the present; and feeling indebted to you, under God, for much light in the Scriptures, they would tender their sympathy and support to the Examiner, as they wish still to continue an investigation of the "Truth as it is in Jesus." It matters not that we do not agree with you in all the details of the Future Age, as held and advanced in the past. We have not a disposition to "pick out your eyes," nor to destroy your glasses. We hold that when the Lord shall bring again Zion, "His watchmen (will) see eye to eye," who now see through a "glass darkly." Relative to the themes of Life and Death, which are made prominent in your paper, we feel the fullest confidence that they have their foundation in the living words of God's living Son. And further, we feel confident that your recent prediction will be verified—"That a paper which advocates these truths will meet a support." Men who have been enlightened by the truth will not barter it for "pottage," nor regard what some deem treading on *their* "precious jewels."

—

BR. DANIEL B. ELDRED writes:

HOMER, Mich.

BR. STORRS:—I am much pleased with the present form of the Examiner. I think the change is a good one, as it forms a very convenient tract to lend about the vicinity, and thereby continue to point to the record that God has given of his Son. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." How true it is that men are unwilling to have eternal life through the Son of God. They will not come to him that they might have life, but climb up some other way; looking to the Platonic teachers, instead of the word of God for the truth. Notwithstanding all this, there is here and there one that will believe the record God has given of his Son. Brother E. Miller, Jr., is a faithful minister of the word. He is travelling a kind of circuit in this State, and a part of Indiana; and we think it important to have your Examiner in circulation as much as possible. We can point to several prominent conversions through its instrumentality.

—

E. W. KNIGHT writes:

GLEN'S FALLS, N. Y.

BROTHER STORRS:—You may be surprised at not receiving subscriptions from this place. The cause is this: the people have been, and are yet, very much opposed to "Millerism"—myself as much so as is the Bible; and have been from the first knowledge which I had of his calculating particular time; not from prejudice, but by applying the sure test; that is, the teaching of Christ. I have but one way of examining the Bible. My way is to test all by the teachings and spirit, or acts of Christ. Deut. 18: 15. Acts 3: 22, 23. Matt. 17: 5. These passages, with several others, prove that Christ is to be heard in *all* things. "Watch ye, therefore, *for ye know* NOT," said Christ, the Son of the living God. "Watch, *for ye know*," said Mr. Miller. The people of this place generally shun the very appearance of every thing that even appears like Mr Miller's doctrine; and it is hard to make them believe that the Examiner is not a "Miller paper," as they call it.

MERRIHEW & THOMPSON, PRINTERS, 7 CARTER'S ALLEY.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. **PHILADELPHIA, APRIL, 1848.** **No. 4.**

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 21 N. SIXTH STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—NO. V.

THE THRONE OF DAVID.

In our last article on this subject we showed that Jehovah had "made an everlasting covenant with David," in reference to his throne and kingdom, "ordered in all things and sure." We shall now proceed to show that David's throne will be *the throne of the world;* and that David's son will sit thereon, and reign as "King of kings and Lord of lords."

And, first, permit us to state that David's throne is not in heaven above, and that, consequently, the Messiah, David's son, is not now sitting on it. David's "crown" has been "profaned," and "cast down to the ground;" and, surely, no one will contend that these phenomena took place in heaven! Besides, it must be obvious to the most ignorant that David never reigned in heaven; which he must have done, if, indeed, his throne be there, or, else, he reigned without sitting on it! But Jesus is not on the throne of his father David, for that throne has not been in existence for more than two thousand years! Neither is the Messiah, as some suppose, sitting on *his own* throne, for *he* has no throne except David's; and he is the only rightful *heir* to *it*. Jesus himself, however, settles this question, for he says: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on MY THRONE, even as I also overcame, and am sit down with *my Father* ON HIS THRONE." Rev. 3: 21. We learn from this testimony that Jesus is now sitting "on" his "Father's throne;" and he promises that those who "overcome" shall sit "with him on *his* throne." The Messiah, then, has never yet reigned as King—as the Son of God; and as mediator between God and man, he "sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high, waiting till his foes be made his footstool." Moreover, he promised his apostles that, when he should "sit on the throne of his glory, they, also, should sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." It is impossible, therefore, that He can now be sitting on "his throne," for the twelve apostles are slumbering in the dust of death, and the twelve tribes are in the dispersion. Before they can sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes, they must be restored—the Messiah must be revealed from Heaven—the "tabernacle of David" rebuilt—his throne erected, and the Lord Jesus must be exalted to it—*then* the twelve apostles, being raised from the dead, will sit on twelve thrones, judging or ruling the restored tribes of Israel. Then the prediction of Isaiah, concerning the reign of Messiah, will be fulfilled: "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign on Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before (or in the midst of) his *ancients* gloriously." Isaiah 24: 23. David, in reference to this time, says: "The Lord is King for ever and ever; the heathen have perished out of *his land*." The Messiah is to have "the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession." "He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and thy poor with judgment. The mountains shall bring peace to the people, and the little hills by righteousness. He (the Messiah) shall judge the poor of the people, he shall save the children of the needy, and *shall break in pieces the oppressor*. They shall fear thee (O Messiah) as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations. He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass: as showers that water the earth. In *his days shall* THE RIGHTEOUS FLOURISH; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. *He shall have* DOMINION *also* FROM SEA TO SEA, *and from the river to the ends of the earth. They that dwell in the wilderness shall* BOW BEFORE HIM; AND HIS ENEMIES SHALL LICK THE DUST. THE KINGS OF TARSHISH AND OF THE ISLES SHALL BRING PRESENTS: THE KINGS OF SHEBA AND SEBA SHALL OFFER GIFTS. YES, ALL KINGS SHALL FALL DOWN BEFORE HIM: ALL NATIONS SHALL SERVE HIM. And he shall live, and to him shall be given of the gold of Sheba; prayer also shall be made for him continually; and daily shall he be praised. His name shall endure forever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and *men shall be blessed in him:* ALL NATIONS SHALL CALL HIM BLESSED." 72d Psalm. This will, be the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham that "*in him, and his* SEED ALL NATIONS *should be blessed.*"

Again, the Psalmist says: "*All nations* whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord, and shall glorify thy name." Ps. 86: 9.

From the above testimony, and much more which might be introduced, for the Bible is full of it, it is evident that in "the age to come," the "throne of David" will be *the* throne of the world; and that Messiah's dominion will extend over all countries republics, kingdoms and empires: that his authority will be acknowledged by all kings, monarchs, and emperors; and that every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess that he is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." "*And the Lord,*" says Zechariah, "*will be king over* ALL THE EARTH: *in that day will there be* ONE LORD, *and his* NAME ONE." Chap. 14: 9. "And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of *all the nations,*" after "the Judgment of the great day of God Almighty," of which we shall hereafter speak, "*which* came against Jerusalem

shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles," which will be the *antitype* of the Jewish feast. "And it shall be, that whoever will not come up of *all the families of the earth* TO JERUSALEM TO WORSHIP THE KING, the Lord of hosts, even *upon them shall be no rain.* And if the family of Egypt shall not go up, and shall not come, that have no rain; there shall be the plague, with which the Lord will smite the heathen that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles. This shall be the punishment of Egypt, and the punishment of all nations that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles."

Here we have several important truths presented to our consideration:

1. That in the age to come, when Jerusalem shall be the metropolis of the world, and Messiah shall be reigning on the throne of his Father David, "*all nations* shall go up to Jerusalem to worship the King, the Lord of hosts." We are not, however, to understand that every person who shall then compose the nations of the earth will go up to Jerusalem, (although the increased facilities for travelling might render even this practicable;) but, that all nations, by their *Representatives*, should go up to worship the Lord. Who these representatives shall be, will claim our attention hereafter.

2. We have the punishment which shall be inflicted upon the nation, or nations, that shall refuse to go up to Mount Zion to worship the King, the Lord of hosts—"*they shall have no rain.*"

3. But as this would be no punishment to Egypt, *seeing they have no rain, special* provision is made for them as a nation—*they are to have the "plague."* Thus we have indicated a *part* of the *policy*, which will obtain, *nationally*, in the age to come.

Let the reader remember the quotation from the Psalms, which declares that "the kings of Sheba and Seba shall bring presents, and offer gifts;" and then read the following in reference to the glory of Mount Zion and Jerusalem, when that state of things to which we have adverted, shall obtain: "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Lift up thy eyes around, and see; all they assemble themselves, they come to thee: thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side. Then thou shalt see, and flow together, and thy heart shall fear, and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted (or turned) to thee, the forces (or wealth) of the Gentiles shall come to thee. The multitude of camels shall cover thee, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah; all they from Sheba shall come: they shall bring gold and incense; and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord. All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered to thee; they shall come up with acceptance on my altar, and I (the Lord) will glorify the house of my glory. Surely the isles shall wait for me (the Lord of hosts) and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons (O Zion) from far; their silver and their gold with them, to the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee," O Jerusalem! "And the sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister to thee: for in my wrath I smote thee, but in my favour have I had mercy on thee. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring to thee the forces (or wealth) of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. *For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish;* YES, THOSE NATIONS SHALL BE UTTERLY WASTED." Isaiah 60.

But we must turn from the contemplation of the authority and dominion of the Lord of hosts, and the glory, splendor, and magnificence of Jerusalem, when it shall be the metropolis of *his* empire—when all the kings, monarchs, emperors, and great men of the earth, shall surrender their authority, power, and wealth, and lay them at the feet of the King of kings and Lord of lords—we must turn, for the present, from this glorious and spirit-stirring theme to the RESTORATION OF ISRAEL, which will be the subject of our next number. J. T. W.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—NO. VI.

THE RESTORATION OF ISRAEL.

Will Israel ever be restored? is a question of the first importance in the consideration of this subject. Some deny that they will ever be restored to their own land: but it would be easy to show that the destiny of the world turns upon the truth of this doctrine. We do not, however, design to go very extensively into a discussion of this point. We wish to give the *general outlines* of the things relating to the "Kingdom of God," in this series of articles; and to fill them up at some future time. The restoration of Israel, alone, would fill a volume. We shall, therefore, content ourselves with the presentation of a few testimonies on the question. We shall accompany the testimony with a few remarks.

1. In the eleventh chapter of Isaiah we have a prediction concerning, first, the birth of the Messiah: "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots."

2. We have his character indicated: "And the spirit of the Lord will rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord: And will make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he will not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: But with righteousness will he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth."

3. We have a prediction, which evidently relates to the future, concerning a judgment which he will execute upon the wicked: "And he will smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips will he slay the wicked."

4. We have a prophecy concerning the nature of Messiah's reign: "And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the suckling child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the den of the basilisk. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: *For the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.*"

5. We then have a glowing prediction relative to the *restoration of Israel*—a prediction, which the student of the Bible will at once perceive, has never been fulfilled: "And in *that day,*" the day of Mes-

siah, "there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and HIS REST SHALL BE GLORIOUS. And it shall come to pass in *that day*, that *the Lord will set his hand* AGAIN *the* SECOND TIME *to recover* the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from *Assyria*, and from *Egypt*, and from *Pathros*, and from *Cush*, and from *Elam*, and from *Shinar*, and from *Hamath*, and from the *isles of the Sea*. And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, *and shall assemble* THE OUTCASTS OF ISRAEL, *and* GATHER THE DISPERSED OF JUDAH FROM THE FOUR CORNERS OF THE EARTH. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not distress Ephraim."

This prophecy refers to "the whole house of Israel"—that is, to the twelve tribes—*Israel* and *Judah* being included. And they are here distinguished by "*the outcasts of Israel*," and "*the dispersed of Judah*" And they are represented as being carried *westward;* they, therefore, come from the east—from the north-east of Asia, and those other countries already referred to, to which the ten tribes were carried away captive by Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, and from which they have never yet returned. The Lord, by his great power, will prepare an "highway," for the return of his people, by "utterly destroying the tongue of the Egyptian sea:" "he will shake his hand over the river" of Egypt, and will "smite it in the seven streams" thereof, and "make them go over dry shod, as it was to Israel in the day that he came up from the land of Egypt."

Again, in the 27th chapter of Isaiah, we have this testimony: "And it shall come to pass in *that day*," in the "day the Lord with his keen and great and strong sword will punish leviathan, the piercing serpent," and "slay the dragon that is in the sea"—"*in that day* the Lord shall gather from the channel of the river (Euphrates) to the stream of Egypt, (the Nile,) *and you shall be gathered one by one*, O YE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL. And it shall come to pass *in that day*, that the great trumpet shall be blown, *and they shall come who were ready to perish in the land of Assyria, and the outcasts in the land of Egypt, and* SHALL WORSHIP THE LORD ON THE HOLY MOUNT AT JERUSALEM." Again: "In that day will the Lord of hosts be for a crown of glory, and for a diadem of beauty, *to the residue of his people*." Ch. 28: 5. Moreover, it is declared, that "*Israel shall be saved* in the Lord with an *everlasting salvation:* you shall not be *confounded* nor *ashamed* WORLD WITHOUT END." Ch. 45: 17. This prediction has never yet been fulfilled; for they have been "ashamed" and "confounded," for more than *two thousand years*. Let us now turn to the testimony of the prophet Jeremiah, ch. 3: 12. "Go and proclaim these words towards the north, and say, Return thou backsliding Israel, saith the Lord; and I will not cause my anger to fall upon you: for I am merciful, saith the Lord, and I will not keep anger for ever. Only acknowledge thy iniquity, that thou has transgressed against the Lord thy God, and hast scattered thy ways to the strangers under every green tree, and you have not obeyed my voice, saith the Lord. Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord; *for I am married to you:* and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, *And I will bring you to Zion*: And I will give you pastors according to my heart, who shall feed you with knowledge and understanding. And it shall come to pass, when you shall be multiplied and increased in the land, in those days, saith the Lord, they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of the Lord: neither shall it come to mind; neither shall they remember it; neither shall they visit it; neither shall that be done any more, AT THAT TIME THEY SHALL CALL JERUSALEM THE THRONE OF THE LORD; *and all nations shall be gathered to it, to the name of the Lord*, TO JERUSALEM; neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of an evil heart. *In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel*, and they shall come together from the land of the north to *the land that I have given for an* INHERITANCE TO YOUR FATHERS.

The hostility which obtained between Judah and Israel will then be removed, and they will worship the Messiah together on the holy mount at Jerusalem.

Again, we have another prediction: "Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be said, The Lord liveth that brought the children of Israel out of the land of Egpyt; but, The Lord liveth, that brought the children of Israel from the land of the north, and from all the lands whither he had driven them: and I will bring them again into their land that I gave to their fathers.

Behold, I will send for many *fishers*, saith the Lord, *and they shall fish them;* and afterwards will I send for many *hunters, and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks*." Jeremiah, 16: 14—16.

Once more, the Lord has said: "For lo! the days come, that I will bring again the captivity of *Israel* and *Judah*, saith the Lord: and I will cause them to *return to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it*." Ch. 30: 3. And when they are thus restored, the Prophet declares that "they shall serve the Lord their God, *and* DAVID THEIR KING, whom I will raise up to them." Verses 8, 9.

From the testimony submitted we learn, that Israel and Judah will be restored; and that, when restored to their own land, they shall dwell together in peace; and serve the Lord their God, and the BELOVED, (for such is the English of *David*,) whom Jehovah will raise up to them.

But, although we have scarcely commenced giving the testimony of the prophets upon this interesting question, we must leave them, and turn our attention to the evidence of the Apostle Paul: In his Epistle to the Romans, he argues the question of the *fall* of Israel, on account of their unbelief—their being cut off from their own olive, and the grafting in of the Gentiles. He informs the Romans "that *blindness* had happened to Israel, *until the fulness of the Gentiles shall be come in;*" and concludes by asserting that "ALL ISRAEL SHALL BE SAVED;" and then quotes this authority—"As it is written, There shall come out of Sion (or 'to Sion,' as it ought to be rendered) the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." Romans, 11. We are not to understand, however, that *every Israelite* will be saved; for the apostle says elsewhere, that "a remnant" shall be saved; but that *all the twelve tribes* are to be the subjects of the salvation spoken of by the Prophets. It will be a national salvation, political and ecclesiastical in its nature.

The twelve tribes, then, gathered out of all the countries whither the Lord has driven them, and restored to the land of their fathers—the land promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, will be *mortal*

men and women, organized under the new covenant which Jehovah will give to the house of Israel and the house of Judah. Messiah will be their king; and the twelve apostles will be associated with him in the administration of the affairs of the kingdom of God. These restored Israelites will not "inherit the kingdom," but they will be *subjects*; for the Messiah, according to the Prophets, is "to *reign* over the house of Israel for ever." How beautiful! how forcible!! and how sublime!!! is the language of Jesus to his apostles, when he said: "Verily I say to you, that ye who have followed me, *in the regeneration*, WHEN THE SON OF MAN SHALL SIT ON THE THRONE OF HIS GLORY, YOU, ALSO, SHALL SIT UPON TWELVE THRONES, JUDGING THE TWELVE TRIBES OF ISRAEL" Matt. 19: 28.

Here we behold the Messiah, the Prince and Author of life, who was "born that he might be a king," promising to those "who had followed him," that, "in the regeneration"—the grand era of the new creation—the creation of the new earth and heavens—"*when the Son of man should* SIT UPON THE THRONE OF HIS GLORY," the twelve apostles "*should also* SIT UPON TWELVE THRONES *judging the twelve tribes of Israel!*"

And how short-sighted are those who refer the fulfilment of this sublime promise to the "day of Pentecost." For, at that time, the *ten tribes* were far away from the land of their fathers; Jesus was not "sitting on the throne of his glory," but on the "throne of his Father;" and the apostles, so far from sitting on "twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel," were, with other disciples, assembled in an "upper room for fear of the Jews."

This, then, is all in the future; and it opens up to us a scene of glory, grandeur, and sublimity, far transcending the Royal Courts of this perishing state! Alas! what a dreaming world this is! Their eyes are shut to the glory of the future! Their ears are deaf to the voice of inspiration! They are "without hope and without God in the world."

J. T. W.

END OF THE WICKED.

"IS ANNIHILATION THE PENALTY OF THE LAW?"

The editor of the "True Wesleyan," Luther Lee, takes up the above question in his paper of December 25th. The following review of Br. Lee, is by Br. Grew, of this city. Though it may be thought somewhat long, we were unwilling to divide it, and it will well pay for a careful perusal. The late Orange Scott once said to us, "If any body can answer your argument on the End of the Wicked, Luther Lee can." We bid *him* welcome to the work, or any one else. We want nothing but the truth; if we have it not, we desire to know where it is.

REVIEW OF LUTHER LEE.

When my mind was first enlightened to understand, as I humbly trust, the great truth that "the wages of sin is DEATH," the main arguments now offered by Mr. Lee, editor of the True Wesleyan, to sustain his views, were carefully examined. They may be found in Edwards' answer to Chauncy. I beg the reader's candid consideration of my reply to these arguments.

ARGUMENT 1.

"The Scriptures represent the punishment of the wicked as consisting in positive suffering, rather than in merely ceasing to exist. Luke 16: 23. 'And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torment.' ver. 24. 'I am tormented in this flame.' verse 25. 'Now he is comforted and thou art tormented.' Matt. 18: 34, 35. 'And his Lord was wroth and delivered him to the tormentors till he should pay all that was due unto him. So shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if you from your hearts forgive not every one his brother.' Rev. 14: 11. 'The smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever.' Matt. 8: 12. 'There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.' These Scriptures, with many more which might be quoted, describe the punishment of sin, but they do not describe annihilation,—nor is it possible for what is here described to co-exist with annihilation."

Now I ask, how do these passages prove that "the punishment of the wicked" consists "in positive suffering *rather* than in merely ceasing to exist?" I affirm that these passages do not prove it, because,

1. Not one of them declares this.

2. Not one of them necessarily implies endless suffering. Rev. 14: 11, is not an exception. It is an undeniable truth that the inspired writers often use the terms translated "ever" and "forever and ever," &c., in reference to subjects which have a limited duration. Indeed, the original term *aion*, properly imports limited duration, age, ages, &c. It is worthy of consideration that terms implying unlimited duration, as *aphthartos* (immortal, incorruptible,) *athanatos* (never-dying,) *akatalutos* (indissoluble,) which are applied to the life and felicity of the righteous, are never, in the Scriptures of truth, applied to the life and misery of the wicked. It pertains to those who prefer the words which man's wisdom teacheth to those which the Holy Ghost teacheth, (though they may not intend this) to teach the tradition of immortal wo.

If then these passages do not necessarily imply *endless* suffering, or declare that the suffering, whatever it may be, is the punishment of sin *rather* than ceasing to exist, how do they prove it?

I affirm that these passages do not prove it, because.

3. We are to learn what is the chief penalty of the law or wages of sin, from those passages which plainly declare it, rather than from parables, or even from plain threatenings of some of the evil consequences of transgression. The word of the Lord is perfectly plain on this subject. Alas! how has the counsel of the Lord been darkened by words without knowledge. What was the declaration of the Almighty respecting the penalty for transgression when he first gave law to man? Was it thou shalt *suffer immortal wo*, or *endless torments?* No "Thou shalt surely DIE," or rather "*dying* thou shalt *die*." The same plain truth is repeated. "The soul that sinneth it shall DIE." Again. "The *wages* of sin is DEATH." When the inspired apostle would exhibit the great penal consequence and desert of sin, he uses, not the term *suffering or torment*, but DEATH. Now I ask, if we affirm that *suffering* rather than *death*, (which is a cessation of life or conscious being,) is the wages of sin, do we teach according to the oracles of God?

These passages, which exhibit only a part of the evil consequences of sin, fail to prove that con-

scious suffering, rather than cessation of existence, is the great penalty of the law, because,

4. The terms used by the Spirit of Truth to describe the future and final punishment of the wicked accord with the first great threatening of death to the sinner. These terms are "*destruction*," "*perdition*," "*lost*," "*consumed*," "*burnt up*," "*devoured*," &c. Concerning the import of these terms, we need not doubt, for the destruction threatened is declared to be a "destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power," which fills the universe; and a destruction, not of happiness or well-being merely, but a destruction of "SOUL AND BODY in hell." Matt. 10: 28. Surely the husbandman puts the fire to the chaff which he allows no one to quench, with the design to *burn it up* and not to preserve it forever. So our Lord plainly teaches that the tares, the children of the wicked one, will be burned up.

These passages, none of which necessarily imply unlimited suffering, cannot prove that cessation of being is not the great penalty of the law of God, because,

5. Destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power, is a punishment of LOSS of far greater magnitude, and much more to be dreaded than any limited suffering which man can endure. Suppose a man to suffer a million of ages all that he is capable of suffering, mentally and physically, and then by some dispensation of divine mercy, he should be introduced into the presence of the Lord to enjoy his glory eternally! How trifling would all his sufferings be when compared with the "far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."

It is said that "these Scriptures—describe the punishment of sin, but they do not describe annihilation." "Annihilation" is an unscriptural term. If by it is meant only an entire destruction of conscious being, or, as our Lord teaches, of "*soul and body*;" I have no objection to it. As, however, it is used by our opponents, as the basis of a philosophical objection, I do not use it in reference to the subject at issue. I affirm that "these Scriptures" express only *a part* of the punishment of sin. They do not state what the Scriptures declare the wages of sin to be, nor what God threatened Adam if he sinned. The fact that these particular passages do not describe utter destruction of being, is no more proof against such destruction, than the fact that some passages which describe the future felicity of the righteous, do not affirm its duration, is proof that it is not endless. The *silence* of one passage of Scripture is not to be adduced to oppose the *plain* and *positive testimony* of another.

The actual sufferings described in the passages quoted, cannot indeed "co-exist with annihilation" or conscious being, but this is no proof that they will not end in such destruction.

MR. LEE'S SECOND OBJECTION.

It is as follows:—"The Scriptures represent the punishment of the wicked as being inflicted in degrees, proportionate to the different degrees of ill desert on the part of sinners, individually; but annihilation admits of no degrees." "If annihilation be the penalty of the law, no man can receive a greater condemnation than annihilation, which the least must receive, who are condemned at all, for it admits of no degrees." To this I reply,

1. The fact that the Scriptures represent that divine justice will be honored by the infliction of various degrees of suffering, antecedent to final destruction from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power, is no proof that THE great penalty of the law does not consist in this destruction. This may reasonably be, as in fact we have seen it is, God's *great* and *chief* threatening for rebellion although it will be preceded by different degrees of suffering.

2. Although *subsequent* to utter destruction, sinners of different degrees will be on a level; it is not true that God's manner of destroying sinners "admits of no degrees."

It is no more true than that his supposed act of holding *all* impenitent sinners in eternal misery admits of no degrees. If God can hold all sinners in eternal misery with different degrees of suffering, he can destroy all sinners with different degrees of suffering. As the first death is attended by various degrees of suffering, so will it be with the second, which will terminate existence forever.

Mr. L. remarks, that "the common reply" to the two arguments above considered, "is, that the penalty of the law is neither suffering nor annihilation, by themselves, but is made up in part of both." To which he replies: "1. It is absurd to suppose that the penalty of the law is two things, and neither. It must be the one or the other, but not both. 2. This view is wholly unfounded in Scripture. We venture that not one text can be adduced which refers to any such division in the claims of the law, in the kind of punishment it demands."

I understand Mr. Lee, here to represent that every text which refers to the punishment of sin, refers to punishment of *the same* kind of *one* kind *only*, and that of "positive suffering." The texts he has quoted to prove what the punishment is, all imply "positive suffering." He quoted no text which threatens death, destruction, perdition, &c. I shall now quote 2 Thess. 1: 9, "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." I affirm that the manifest import of this threatening is a destruction *of persons*, or, as our Lord teaches "of soul and body." Matt. 10: 28. The passage contains no threatening of any "positive suffering," but what is implied in their destruction. It is a most solemn threatening of the doom of the wicked at the second coming of the Lord Jesus. Whether the doctrine of eternal misery is true or false, this passage plainly teaches that the punishment of sin consists in loss, and not in "*positive suffering*" only; it consists, certainly in part or in whole, of banishment from the glorious presence of the Lord, whether the destruction be a destruction of "soul and body" or not. If then the scriptural declarations of the manner in which God will punish the wicked teach us what is the penalty of the law as Mr. Lee himself argues, then it follows from 2 Thess. 1: 9, and all the passages which declare that punishment to be *death*, *perdition*, *destruction*, &c. that such destruction, &c., pertains to the penalty of the law.

Whether it is most proper to consider the penalty of the law as consisting in destruction of being only, or in such destruction and different degrees of previous suffering, I ask for the proof that "it is absurd to suppose that the penalty of the law is two things." Is it absurd for a legislature to make the penalty of transgressing a law, both fine and imprisonment? He who can believe that it is *rea-*

sonable and *just* for "the *Father of Mercies*" to punish a man for a single sin, and that the least which he can commit, by holding him in never ending torment, is the last person to charge others with absurdities.

Although the loss of being and of the eternal enjoyment of the ever blessed God is a punishment of such magnitude as not to be compared with any antecedent suffering, and consequently is most properly to be considered as THE penalty of the law, it is quite immaterial to the question at issue, whether we consider the penalty of the law to consist in this only, or in this and antecedent positive suffering. The term "penalty of the law," is not scriptural. However, we may argue about it, it is an undeniable fact that the Scriptures of truth plainly teach these two things; 1. that God will punish the finally impenitent with the "positive suffering" of many or few stripes, according to the different degrees of their criminality; and 2. That he will punish them with everlasting destruction from his presence and glory; with "the second death," "perdition," being "burnt up," "utterly consumed," destruction of "both soul and body in hell." So far from this being "absurd," it is precisely the reverse. It would be absurd not to do it. It would be "absurd" for the just God to adopt destruction of being simply, without any different degrees of preceding positive suffering, as his punishment of sinners.

MR. LEE'S THIRD OBJECTION.

"If annihilation be any part of the penalty of the law, it must be the smallest degree of punishment awarded to any sinner, and of course, all punishment over the smallest degree must consist in suffering, and not in annihilation. Suppose then a man to die after committing his first sin, for that one sin he must be annihilated. Suppose another man to commit ten thousand sins, and die a hundred years old. The punishment of one sin is annihilation, and of course the punishment of the 9999 sins is previous suffering; the one part ending all the rest, must be a blessing and can be no part of a curse. Again, if 9999 parts of the penalty of the law can be met in suffering, we are able to see no good reason why the one additional part could not be met in the same way and supercede the necessity of annihilation."

Let us first apply this reasoning to Mr. Lee's own opinion. "If (eternal misery) be any part of the penalty of the law, it must be the smallest degree of punishment awarded to any sinner, and of course, all punishment over the smallest degree must consist in (greater degree of suffering,) and not (simply in eternal misery.) Suppose, then, a man to die after committing his first sin, for that one sin he must suffer (eternal misery.) Suppose another man to commit ten thousand sins, and die a hundred years old. The punishment of one sin is (eternal misery,) and of course the punishment of the 9999 is (greater degrees of suffering.) Again, if 9999 parts or the penalty of the law can be met in (greater degrees of suffering,) we are able to see no good reason why the one additional part could not be met in the same way, and supercede the necessity of (eternal misery.)"

This reasoning is more ingenious than solid. If future punishment is eternal misery, it is the *eternity* which constitutes the greatness of the punishment. If it is destruction of being, it is the LOSS of the eternal enjoyment of the blessed God which constitutes its greatness. Destruction of being, involving *this incalculable loss*, must, *in itself considered*, be, in all circumstances, "a curse," not "a blessing." That it may be a less curse than such endless torments in hell, as some men describe, I freely admit to the honor of the divine character; but the terms less "curse," and "a blessing," can hardly be considered synonymous. Does the law threaten the murderer with "*a blessing*" because death terminates the agonies of strangulation?

MR. LEE'S FOURTH OBJECTION.

"The punishment of the wicked is associated with the punishment of the devil and the fallen angels, which does not appear to be annihilation." Matt. 25: 41. 2 Peter 2: 4. Jude 6. — hark! the devils cry out—'what have we to do with thee, Jesus thou Son of God? art thou come to torment us before the time?' It was not annihilation then that they feared," &c.

If our brother had done the devils justice, and hearkened to them a little longer to hear *all* their testimony on the subject, instead of turning away when he had heard just enough to suit his own theory, he might have received some good instruction by hearing them cry, "art thou come to DESTROY us?" Matt. 8: 29. Mark 1: 24. By all they said, it is evident that they expect to be tormented in a manner which will issue in their destruction. Be this as it may, the testimony of the Spirit of Truth must not be rejected. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might DESTROY him that had the power of death, that is the *devil*." Heb. 2: 14.

The reference of Jude to the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, "suffering the vengeance of" aionion (age, lasting,) fire, is a reference to an example set forth and seen in this present world in the destruction of those cities for their iniquities.

MR. LEE'S FIFTH OBJECTION.

"The Scriptures describe the fearfulness of the punishment of the wicked, by the character and duration of the suffering which is to constitute such punishment. 'Cast into hell; into the fire that never shall be quenched—where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched; these shall go away into everlasting punishment.'"

I affirm that the Scriptures describe the fearfulness of the punishment of the wicked by the terms "*death*," "*second death*," *destruction of the soul and body*, i. e. of conscious being, by coming to an "*end*;" by *perishing*, by being *utterly consumed*, by not entering into life, and by the tremendous consequence of their destruction in the loss of the everduring joys and glories of "Immortality," in "the presence of the Lord," and "the glory of his power." Mark 9: 45, 46, proves the very opposite to that for which it is adduced. Let Scripture explain Scripture. See Matt. 13: 40—"As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world." Christ "will gather his wheat into his garner, and he will BURN UP the chaff with unquenchable fire." If the fire "is not quenched," the tares, or chaff, will be entirely consumed. If the worm dies not, the carcase is wholly devoured. The wicked will indeed go away "into everlasting punishment." As the punishment is destruction, and that destruction is

everlasting, it necessarily follows that their punishment is everlasting.

Mr. Lee's Last Argument.

"The expressions 'death,' 'shall die,' 'destruction,' 'shall be destroyed,' &c., are all used in other senses than that of annihilation."

That these terms, which, in their proper and literal import, as applied to man, plainly import the cessation of conscious existence, are sometimes used in a secondary or figurative sense, is true. This, however, gives us no authority to set aside their primary and literal import where there is no necessity to do so. If we do so, we make the Scriptures a nose of wax, and can prove any thing we please. God threatens the violator of his law with *death*. Sin is the transgression of the law. Death is the opposite of life, the cessation of it. "The soul that sinneth, it shall *die*." "The wages of sin is *death*." Does the Almighty promulgate the fearful penalty of his law in *figurative* terms? Does any earthly legislator do this? If the terms *death, destruction, destroy soul and body, perdition, burned up, utterly consumed*, &c., &c., are to be understood *figuratively*, who shall determine their import? If, indeed, the word of the Lord as plainly declared that the wages of sin is immortal woe, or eternal life in misery, as it declares that the wages of sin is *death;* if it as plainly and positively declared that the soul that sinneth shall live forever in torment, as it does that the soul that sinneth shall die, then indeed we might enquire after some figurative import for the one or the other of these contradictory passages. But when these threatenings of death, destruction, &c., which are so plain that he who runs may read and understand, are not even apparently contradicted by a single passage in the original Scriptures connecting actual suffering with endless duration, it appears to me a great perversion of scripture to set aside their literal import to twist them into harmony with this horrible doctrine. So far from the justice, or any other perfection, of the Almighty, requiring any greater punishment than is implied in the literal import of these dreadful threatenings, it is an impeachment of those perfections to suppose it. That the entire and everlasting destruction of the sinner from the presence and glory of God, attended with various degrees of torment as justice can apportion antecedent to cessation of being, is an adequate manifestation of the great evil of sin and of the divine displeasure against it, is a proposition which no man can reasonably deny. Mr. L. remarks: "The expression '*cut him asunder*' as clearly expresses the act of taking away existence, as any term used; and yet, after they are cut asunder, they receive their portion and weep and gnash their teeth." I reply that our Lord's declaration does not necessarily imply any thing more than that destruction shall be connected with weeping and gnashing of teeth. If this is denied, we may refer the expression, "cut him asunder," to the first death, which is expressed by the terms "cut off," "cut down," which is perfectly compatible with the destruction of his being, by the second death, in the lake of fire where there will be weeping, wailing, &c. However we may understand the passage, it certainly is not true that the phrase "cut him asunder," "as clearly expresses the act of taking away existence (*forever*) as any term used." The declaration, "whose END is *destruction*," and the expressions "*everlasting* destruction," "destroyed *forever*," "perdition," "lost," all express it more clearly.

"How futile is it then, to pretend that any or all of" the passages adduced by Mr. Lee, prove that sinners will exist in endless misery, "in the face of so much proof," that "they shall be destroyed forever." Ps. 92: 7. Henry Grew.

ANOTHER LETTER OF CHAS. FITCH'S.

The following extract of a letter was written to the Editor of the Examiner by the late Charles Fitch, a few months before he "fell asleep." We see that Br. J. B. Cook has placed it in the "Appendix" to his work on "The True Source of Immortality;" but, we are sorry he should have omitted to state to whom the letter was addressed. It there appears as if it was written to himself. For the information of those of our readers who may never have heard of Br. Fitch, we would say, he was a holy, able, and faithful minister of the gospel: one who did not shun to declare the whole counsel of God, as he understood it, whatever reproach he might suffer for it. He fell asleep in Jesus, at Buffalo, N.Y., in Sept. or Oct. 1844.

Cleaveland, [Ohio] May 25th, 1844.

Dear Brother Storrs:—I have received a long letter from Brother Litch, touching the state of the dead, the end of the wicked, &c. It would be exceedingly pleasant to me, to be able to please him, and the dear brethren who agree with him, for I love them all, and would rejoice to concede anything but truth, to be able to harmonize with them in my views. But there is a Friend who has bought me with his blood, and I take more pleasure in pleasing Him, than in pleasing all the world besides. I never preached my present views touching the state of the dead, and the destruction of the wicked, until fully convinced that I could no longer withhold them without displeasing my blessed Lord and Master. Most sincerely and truly can I call God to record upon my soul, that I have never been influenced in this matter except by a full, solemn and irrepressible conviction to Him who died that I might live. I held my peace, most gladly, I can assure you, just as long as I dared to do it; and when I felt that I had no more right to be ashamed of God's truth on one subject than another, I bowed to His will and consented, henceforth, to believe and teach, that when a man is dead, *he is dead;* and that when a man is cast into a lake of fire and brimstone, and burned up, root and branch, and utterly consumed with terrors, he cannot, *after* that, be *eternally alive*. The idea that man is a being made up of parts, some of which may be dead, and others alive, at the same time, is to me a pagan superstition, out of which the Papists have contrived to raise large sums of money for their own vile purposes: nothing moved by the tremendous fact, that they were robbing God of the glory of being alone immortal, and Christ of the power of having *immortality* to give.

With regard to those brethren who feel called on to contend against the truths that the dead are dead, and that the destruction which awaits the wicked is destruction, and not something else, I have no feelings, I think, but those of brotherly love. They cannot feel any more confident that we are mistaken,

than I do that they are; nor can my reasoning on the subject seem to them more futile, frivolous and inconclusive, than theirs does to me. I certainly have not adopted the views I entertain to gain any worldly good, nor can I ever renounce them for such a purpose. Having been led into them by firm conviction, and through the fear of God alone, nothing else can ever lead me back. And I feel as ready to defend the truth on these subjects in one place as in another; and I might as well attempt to suppress my breath, as to suppress these truths when I preach. I know that by the great body of Second Advent believers, with whom I am acquainted, they are admitted as truth; though ideas of expediency may induce them to be silent. I have heard a few object, but I feel persuaded that it is in some instances through fear that the promulgation of these truths will be detrimental to the influence of truth, touching the coming of the Lord. With this I have nothing to do. God will take care that the preaching of one truth shall not hinder the influence of another. I have been in Buffalo, Rochester and Cincinnati during the last two months, and I have not shunned to declare the whole counsel of God upon these subjects; nor can I, wherever I may be called to preach. I have no wish to differ from my brethren, but if they ask me to withhold God's truth, on any subject to please them, they ask what I am at no liberty to grant.

God willing, I shall see you at no distant day. My faith in the Lord's appearing is unshaken; and I long for it, more than I can express; and that, irrespective of my own interests. I want my Lord Jesus to wear His crown, and fully to taste the joy set before Him when He "endured the cross, despising the shame;" and I want the martyrs, who have bled for Christ, to live and reign with Him.

Yours, in the glorious hope, CHAS. FITCH.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, APRIL, 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Bible.

PAGANISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—We were forcibly struck at noticing the influence the Pagan Fable of an Immortal Soul has upon otherwise intelligent minds, in this age of the world, and under the light of the Bible, by the following editorial scrap in a paper of this city, the day previous to the funeral of John Q. Adams. It is as follows:

"OBSEQUIES OF MR. ADAMS.—From the preparations making, it is believed that the funeral honours to the remains of the illustrious ex-President Adams, on their arrival in this city to-morrow afternoon, will be of such a character as will reflect credit upon the patriotism of Philadelphia. In view of the hallowed associations what a beautiful and sublime feature will be the resting of *the corpse of this patriot* of four-score, for a night in Independence Hall. *If the spirits of 'the just made perfect,' are permitted to mingle, invisible to mortal ken, on this earth, what a meeting will that be* BETWEEN FATHER AND SON, *in the sacred hall where American Liberty first drew its breath!*"

The italicising is our own. Here is "*the corpse* of this patriot in Independence Hall." What next? "If spirits" of the departed signers of the Declaration of Independence, among whom is John Adams, father of him whose "corpse" is to be in the old "Hall," "are to mingle on this earth, what a meeting will that be *between father and son*, in the sacred hall," &c. It must be indeed a wonderful meeting for a "disembodied, immortal spirit" to come to old Independence Hall to *meet* A "CORPSE!!" In the mean time where is the "spirit" of John Q. Adams? Has it had no "meeting" with the "spirit" of his "father?" And must the "spirit of" his "father" come down to Independence Hall to meet "the corpse of" the son in order to have a *wonderful "meeting"!!* It is difficult to portray in language sufficiently vivid the folly that the immortal-soul theory leads men into. Truly, "like priest, like people." The Priests of "undying soul"-ism talk about departed spirits hovering over friends left behind; and no wonder political Editors should talk of "what a meeting between" the "spirit of" a "father and" the "corpse" of his "son"! Surely it must be a very wonderful meeting! What a glorious likeness between them! An immortal spirit and a corpse! What a simlarity of *feeling* they will have! How exactly they will tally together! What a perfect *sympathy!* What exquisite philosophy! "*The dead know not anything*:" Eccl. 9: 5. "*If the dead rise not, then they that are fallen asleep in Christ are perished;*" 1 Corth. 15: 16–18.

THE DEATH BY ADAM.—That death entered into the world by Adam's sin, we believe is a truth admitted by all Christians. They may, and do, differ about the character of that death; but that it involves the *unbuilding* of all men, so that they pass under what we all call death, is not disputed. Is this *unbuilding* of men the penalty of the personal sins of Adam's *posterity?* Seminally, or in Adam's loins, we "all have sinned," as Levi seminally, in Abram's loins, paid tithes to Melchisedec, [Heb. 7: 9, 10.] Whatever death was the penalty of the Adamic law all his posterity were liable to, whether they personally sinned or not. Hence we see multitudes of little children die who have never personally sinned. The *death penalty*, then, for Adam's sin, is not *the penalty* for the personal offences of his posterity: men do not, therefore, receive the penalty of their own sins by the corruption and death flowing from Adam's transgression. But the unchangeable law of God is—"The soul that sinneth it shall die"—and "The wages of sin is death." The Second Adam reverses *not the penalty* of the Adamic law, but restores again to life, all men, after the penalty has been inflicted. But the *continuance in life*, after such restoration, is another, and a very different matter; that depends on

personal character. Those who, during their personal trial, "receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall REIGN IN LIFE, by Jesus Christ;" not only live again, but live forever: "die no more—death hath no more dominion over them." But, if men "will not come to" Christ, "that they might have life," while "the accepted time and day of salvation" continues, they die for their personal transgressions; and this death must necessarily be *after* the restoration from that d a th brought on all men by Adam's sin.

Whether those restored to life will have inflicted upon them "the second death," who have not been "*enlightened*" by revelation, or by the Gospel of the Kingdom in some age, or dispensation past, till they shall have it presented to their minds and personally reject it, is a point about which Christian men may differ. But it is enough for us to know, that men who have been enlightened, and have rejected the light, from love to sin, or "love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil," will "be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his holy ones and to be admired in all them that believe IN THAT DAY." That punishment, we learn from the Scriptures, is *to die the second time;* from this death, which is the wages of personal sins, we have yet to learn where the text is to be found that gives any hope of a resurrection. It is "eternal," "everlasting:" no hope—no recovery. To that death every impenitent sinner is exposed; that death every sinner, who has been called by the truth of God, will experience, except he repent and seeks the remission of his sins, through the "*one Mediator.*" There must be repentance towards God, and a forsaking our personal sins; and the punishment must be *remitted, not inflicted,* or there is no eternal life in us, nor for us. The *punishment* of our personal sins never has been borne by another. If it had been, it would be mockery to offer to forgive the debt. What! first demand and receive payment for our debts, and then turn to us and offer to forgive those debts!! After they are paid profess the debts are still due! No, no; Christ paid no man's debts; and he taught us to pray, "*forgive us our debts.*" But if the common notion that Christ paid our debts is true, we should pray, "Lord, thou wouldst not forgive us our debts, and now thy Son has paid them for us: *so* we will deal with our debtors; somebody shall pay their debts to us."

Christ redeems us from the curse of the Adamic law, and restores all men to life, so that what we lost by Adam we regain by Christ; and, furthermore, he has become our kinsman, redeemer, and the "one Mediator," through and by whom we can now approach unto God and receive a pardon of our personal sins, or the remission of the punishment due to us for those sins, and obtain "the *gift* of God, ETERNAL LIFE," and "not be hurt of the SECOND DEATH."

PROPHETIC PERIODS.—NO. VI.

"*The wise shall understand*" is a phrase that has been much used by those who have contended that the definite time of the second advent of our Lord is revealed in the prophetic numbers, in Daniel. That the wise will understand *some things*, at a given point of time, we have no doubt. That there may be prophetic events, yet future, marked by the commencement of some prophetic period that may give the wise to understand, more definitely than some have supposed, the exact time of the advent, we think, is *possible.* That any past events connected with prophetic periods reveal that time, by means of those periods, we do not believe, unless the 1260 years of Papacy should be found to do it.

The time has not yet arrived, nor have the events occurred which are to give us the scriptural clue to the time of the advent. Dan. 12: 7, concludes, in our translation, with these words—"When he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people all these things shall be finished:" The Septuagint reads, as translated by Thompson, John Q. Adam's favorite translation—"*When an end is put to* THE DISPERSION, *they will know all these things.*" This translation, with present light, we adopt: and think till that "dispersion" of the Jews, "Daniel's people," is ended, vain will be all attempts to arrive at any thing like certainty as to the time of the advent. That dispersion is evidently ending, but is not yet ended. It becomes us to "*watch*"—to mark the passing events of providence; particularly in relation to that long dispersed people, the Jews. Think of it as men will, they are now, and will continue to be "*a sign*" to all who regard the Bible as a revelation from God. The dealings of God with that people reveals the truth of prophecy and revelation with a clearness and conviction that nothing else ever has; and we doubt not they will continue to be a most prominent sign of the coming and reign of Messiah on David's throne. For one, we feel bound, in the name of the Lord, to sound it in the ears of all who hate, despise, or treat with contempt, the literal posterity of Jacob, or who would rob them of the promises made to them, as a people, the awful words of inspiration uttered first by Isaac, Gen. 27: 29—"*Cursed be* EVERY ONE *that curseth thee*, and blessed be he that blesseth thee;" and repeated in Numb. 24: 9, at a time when Balak was anxious to have Balaam curse that people; but God said, *no.* "He couched, he lay down as a lion, and as a great lion; who shall stir him

up? Blessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee." The nations, churches, or individuals who have treated that people with scorn, and attempted to rob them of the promises God has made to them, may well tremble in view of the awful responsibility they have assumed.

When the "dispersion" has an end put to it, we may expect, very soon, to see events take place so clearly showing themselves as the events predicted, to be connected with the advent, as to remove all doubt from the minds of the watchful and wise, as to the immediate appearing of the Lord of Glory. We are disposed to believe the 1290 and 1335 days, Dan. 12th, are literal days, and belong to future events. Our reason for this is, that the prophecy of Dan. 10th to 12th is a *historical* prophecy, and not a *symbolical* one. It is a literal history of events, giving in detail the great outlines of things future. Hence we are not at liberty to make any part of it symbolical—the *time* any more than the *facts*. Besides, the *term* rendered *days*, in this chapter, is the same term used in chapter 10: 13, "The prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty *days*," where no one doubts but that literal days are intended; and it is not the same term translated days, chapter 8th, "Unto 2300 *days*," &c. We conclude, therefore, that the 1290 and 1335 days are literal, and fall within the life time of individuals who will live after the "dispersion" is ended: and perhaps relate to the conduct of the "wilful king," chap. 11th, whose manifestation may yet be future. That this king is an individual king we are constrained to believe, for the same reason that we believe the days are literal. What reason, on earth, can be assigned for making all the other kings in this prophecy individual kings, as is manifest they are, and then convert this wilful one into a symbol to represent a system? The prophecy contemplates "a time of trouble" connected with the reign of this wilful king, or at the close, connected with which is the taking away the daily and setting up of the abomination that astonisheth: from that point there are 1290 days of trouble; and at the close of 1335 days those that have been waiting, and have endured, will be "blessed."

From the Sunday Dispatch.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

"The Ingathering of the Jews.—The Jewish race, kept distinct from all others, and retaining peculiar characteristics for so many centuries, it seems is about to make a movement toward the repossession of the promised land and the holy city. "The Rothschilds, the richest family in the world, and the acknowledged financial head of all the tribes of Israel, have bought the whole land of Canaan—at least, they have the refusal of it, at a price within their means, and can close the bargain whenever they choose to do so.

"They are not wanting in power to sustain themselves in this position. They have a sufficient diplomatic influence in every court in Europe, and nothing is wanting but the complete removal of Jewish disabilities in England, to give them all the influence that they require. The liberal views and conduct of the present Pope are favourable to the great movement, which cannot be far distant.

"The land of Israel, which, under this dynasty, would soon extend from the Nile to the Euphrates, would be in the new track of the commerce of the eastern world. The caravans which transported goods from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf, or directly into the heart of Asia, were superseded by ships, which sailed around the Cape of Good Hope; but steamboats and railroads will soon bring the commerce of Europe and Asia back to its old channel, and the Jews, occupying the central position of Palestine, will make that country the great mart of trade and finance for the whole eastern world. The east and west will both contribute to the riches of the Jewish nation—merchants will flock there from all parts of the world, and lines of steamers on the Mediterranean, the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean, with railroads connecting Egypt, Persia, Hindostan and China, with the city of Jerusalem, can scarcely fail to restore it to all the magnificence and splendor it enjoyed in the days of Solomon.

"These views, as any one may see, are by no means chimerical. The facts on which they are based are sufficiently notorious, and there is nothing either impossible or improbable, in these predictions. These are the views and expectations expressed by some of the most intelligent Jews in this city, and we see no reason for their concealment."

Since the above appeared in the Dispatch, the following Foreign Intelligence has been received:

The Jewish Disability Bill.—The adjourned debate on the bill for removing the civil disabilities of the Jews, was resumed on the 11th inst., by Mr. Pearson, who was followed by Messrs. Cooper, Horseman and Cockburn, in support of the measure, and by Lords Drumlauris and Seymour, and Messrs. Spooner and Banks against. The debate was wound up by a masterly speech from Sir Robert Peel in favour of the bill.

The House then divided, when there appeared

For the Bill, - - - - - -	277
Against the Bill, - - - - -	204
Majority for the second reading,	73

ANGELS—AGGELLO.

The term "angel" is from "*aggelos*," "*aggello*," and signifies "*to tell*"—"*to deliver a message*"—"*a messenger*." The connection and circumstances must determine the nature of the messenger.

Men called Angels.

When men *are called angels the term is always indicative of* office *as messengers.* It is, therefore, when applied to men, an official title. There are numerous instances of this title being applied to men. See Rev. 1: 20, and 2: 1, 8, 12, 18, and 3: 1, 7, 14. In most instances, however, our translators have very properly translated the term, "messenger." See Math. 11: 10, "*aggelon*." See also 2 Corth. 12: 7.

"A thorn in the flesh, the messenger [*aggelos*] of Satan to buffet me," &c. This messenger was, doubtless, the false teachers of which the apostle speaks in the previous chapters. "His letters, say they, are weighty and powerful, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible." At the 13th verse, chapter 11, the apostle says: "Such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel [*aggelon*] of light. [or puts on the appearance of an angel of light.] Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness." See also Luke 7: 24, and 9: 52, and James 2: 25.

Angels who are not men.

Do the Scriptures teach that the term ANGEL *is applied to an order of beings who are not, and never were men, that is, of Adam's race?* Let us look at Heb. 1: 13, 14: "But to which of the angels said he at any time, sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" See also Heb. 2: 16: "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." This text, it appears to us, shows conclusively that there is an order of beings who are not and never were descendants of Adam; whose nature Christ took not on him, or, as the margin reads, "took not hold of," consequently they did not belong to the posterity of Adam. One of these angels appeared to Manoah and his wife: see Judges 13th. At first they supposed him to be merely "a man of God;" but when he "ascended in the flame of the altar" then they "fell on their faces to the ground;" and then they "knew that he was an angel of the Lord;" and "Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die, because we have seen God." Observe here, that to see *an* angel, or *the* angel of the Lord, is said to be seeing God. "True," says one, "because 'the angel of the Lord' is Christ, and he is God." A strange conclusion truly, that *God is his own angel!!*

Angels, as an order of beings, are one in nature, but various in rank.

In nature, is Messiah an Angel?

Is the Lord Jesus Christ an angel, IN NATURE, *of any order or rank of angels?* Let us look at Heb. 1: 4–8, "Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son? And again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him. And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire. But unto the Son, he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom."

Here, if we do not mistake, the apostle affirms that God never said to an *angel*, of any order, "Thou art my Son;" again, he declares that the Son is "much better than the angels;" and again, "Let all the angels of God worship him:" all of which expressions show that he, himself, is not an angel in nature. In the 13th verse the apostle uses this language—"To which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?" That is, God never said this to an *angel;* therefore, the Son of God is not an angel, for God did say this to his Son.

Again, chapter 2, verse 5, Paul says—"Unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world [*age, or dispensation*] to come, whereof we speak;" and verse 8, he says—"For in that he put all in subjection under him: but now we see not yet all things put under him: but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels," &c.

Here, if we mistake not, we have the fact stated that he who is made of God the head of "the world [*or age*] to come," is not an angel; and that though he was higher and better than the angels, yet, to prepare him to be the head and "father of the everlasting age," he was made, for a while, "a little lower than the angels;" but now having "suffered death," he is to be "crowned with glory and honour." The 16th verse, already quoted, expressly declares, that "he took not on him the nature of angels;" which language could have little force if he were in nature an angel of any order.

Once more: Our Lord, himself, when speaking of certain events to take place, Mark 13: 32, says—"Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son," &c. Here he clearly distinguishes himself from the angels; and the form of expression shows that he places himself in a higher scale than the angels, and superior to them. These texts are sufficient to show that our Lord is not, and never was an angel in his nature: therefore he is not "*The angel of the Lord*" spoken of in the Scriptures. *That angel* is evidently one in nature, and a distinct being from our Lord. In proof of this see Lk. 2: 9–11. Here it is expressly said—"The angel of the Lord" proclaimed to the shepherds, saying—"Behold *I* bring you good tidings—for unto you is born this day a Savior, which is Christ the Lord." Here the distinction between "the angel of the Lord," and our Lord Jesus Christ is demonstrated; also, in Matt. 2: 13, the distinction is equally marked—"The angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, saying, arise and take the young child [Jesus] and his mother and flee into Egypt," &c. The same distinction is observed in Matt. 28: 2. "The angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door [of Jesus' sepulchre] and sat upon it," &c. At the 5th verse, it is said, this "angel answered and said unto the women, [who came to the sepulchre,] Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus—*he is not here,*" &c. But, "the angel of the Lord" *was there*, and spake to the women: *therefore*, Jesus *is not* "the angel of the Lord."

Ministration of Angels.

Such being the fact, it seems clear that the common notion on this subject is an error; and it has led to many other errors. It has made men lose sight of the *ministration* of angels. They seem to suppose that whatever is done on earth, God or His Son must do *personally;* thus stripping them of the glory they would give to any earthly king or governor; that of saying to one go, and he goeth; and to his servant do this, and he doeth it. No, they make the Almighty and His Son Jesus Christ to serve *personally*, as though God were incapable of constituting an order of beings with power, or understanding sufficient to manage the affairs of this

province of his dominions, [this globe,] in this age or dispensation. The Scriptures teach us that God has, and does now, in this age, manage the affairs of this world, directly by the ministration of angels. Let us look at a few texts. Gal. 3: 19, "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made: and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." Here the apostle assures us that "the law" itself was "ordained," *i. e.* introduced, or given "by angels." We shall be further satisfied of this by turning to Acts 7: 53, where "Stephen, full of the Holy Spirit," says of the people of Israel, "Who have received the law by the disposition [or ministration] of *angels*, and have not kept it." Compare this again with Heb. 2: 2—"For if the word spoken *by angels* was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord" Jesus, &c. Here the apostle makes a clear distinction between Christ and angels: the angels communicating the law, with all it awful sanctions, and our Lord Jesus Christ bringing in the Gospel, with all its glorious mercy.

Stephen further informs us, Acts 7: 38, speaking of Moses, he says, "This is he, that was in the church [congregation] in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him *in mount Sinai*, and with our fathers; who received the lively oracles to give unto us," &c. Here we have the same truth as repeated by Paul and reiterated by Stephen, at the 58th verse, that the law was given by the ministration of angels, a principal one among them being the chief speaker: that angel being the one who had special charge of the posterity of Jacob, and acted as Jehovah's *agent* in all that related to that people; and still he was but an angel and not Jehovah himself, nor his Son, acting *personally*. Even the Son of God himself, while here upon earth, was ministered unto by angels: see Mat. 4: 6, 11; Lk. 22: 43, "And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him." If then our Lord himself was ministered unto by angels, shall we think it strange if God has ever employed angels in making communications to men, and in managing the affairs of the world? The present world and its affairs are managed by the *ministration* of angels, so to speak, as *agents—officers—"princes,"* &c.; but the next age, or "world to come," is to be under the direct and personal agency of the Son of God: Heb. 2: 5. Some of the angels have the name of God upon them: thus, *Gabriel* signifies, "*Strengh of God*," or "*My strong God*," &c., *Michael* signifies, "*Who is like God.*" This leads us to an *important* inquiry, *viz:*

Is Michael the Lord Jesus Christ?

Let the Scriptures settle this question, and not our fancies, nor the "traditions" of men. First, then, We have shown that *in nature* our Lord is not an angel of *any order*; but "The Son of God," and "better," or superior to angels. Michael is an angel *in nature*, and of the highest order of angels: see Jude 9. "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." It may be proper that we remark upon this text before proceeding further. What are we to understand by "the *body* of Moses?" The same, we think, as Paul meant by the body of Christ. See Col. 1: 24, "Christ—for his body's sake, which is the *church*." Also 1 Cor. 12: 13, 27; "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into *one body*—now ye are the body of Christ," &c. The body of Christ here, is the church of Christ. Is not "the body of Moses" the church, or congregation of Moses?

Did Jude refer to anything written in the Scriptures, or are we left to mere conjecture as to what he means? We think he clearly had reference to things "noted in the Scriptures" Let us turn to Zech. 3: 1, 2: "He showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, [the angel that communicated to Zechariah in the previous chapters] and Satan standing at his right hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan, [by the mouth of the angel,] The Lord rebuke thee O, Satan." Here is the very language quoted by Jude. What was the "resistance" or "dispute" about? The angel adds—"Even the Lord that hath *chosen Jerusalem* rebuke thee: is not this a brand plucked out of the fire?" We see then what the dispute was about, of which Jude speaks, and which he calls "the body of Moses." It was in reference to Jerusalem and the Jews, or the congregation of Moses. The angel of the Lord engaged in this controversy with Satan, Jude tells us, is "Michael;" and that he is the *arch*, or chief angel: *the first* of the order of beings called angels. "Joshua" may be considered the representative of the posterity of Jacob. He and his "fellows" [verse 8,] are declared to be "men wondered at;" that is, men who are signs, or types. They appear to be types of the nation. "Joshua was clothed with filthy garments;" emblematical of the polluted state of the nation for a long period; but those garments were taken away and he was clothed with a change of raiment, so, the Lord said, verse 9, "I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day." "Satan," signifies *adversary;* and in the text may be considered the type of all the *enemies* of the restoration of Jacob, or "the body of Moses," and of Jerusalem being "plucked out of the fire."

We will now examine Dan. 10: 13. "*Michael* one of the chief princes came to help me." The question arises here who spoke these words? The *assumption* that it was Gabriel, and that he spake them of Christ, we consider, stands on a very weak foundation. That Christ appeared to Daniel, and is described by him, verses 5 and 6, none, we presume doubts, as the description corresponds exactly with that of John's, Rev. 1: 13—15, where we know our Lord was the person described. Daniel tells us, verse 9, "I heard the voice of his words"—"and [verse 10] behold a hand touched me"—"and [verse 11] he said unto me," &c. Now, we desire to know, where is the authority for saying that the glorious personage, whom Daniel saw, was not the same whose "hand touched" *him*, and who spoke to him? We confess we see no authority to disprove it; nor, with our present light, do we believe there is any. If then this glorious person was Jesus he certainly was not Michael; for he says—"The prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days; but lo, Michael one of the chief princes came to help me," &c. But, says one, What could Christ want of the help of an angel? We might ask in reply—What does God want of the help of men? Yet, we find the following strong language used in Judges 5: 23, "Curse ye Meroz,

(said the angel of the Lord,) curse ye bitterly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty." God and his Christ both use agents to "help" them, because it pleases God to work by their instrumentality. Michael, therefore, came to help Christ in a matter that related to Daniel's people; which people were emphatically the nation over whom this angel had special charge: and hence called [verse 21st,] "Michael your prince."

The careful reader will observe that this vision, Dan. 10th, was in the third year of Cyrus. That king gave commandment, in the first year of his reign, [see Ezra 1 : 1—4] to restore the people, and to rebuild Jerusalem, according to the prophecy in Isa. 44 : 28, "That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid." Under that decree the restoration of the people commenced, [see Ezra 2d] and the foundation of the temple was laid in the second year of Cyrus: [see Ezra 3 : 8, 10, 11.] Then the enemies of the Jews set themselves to hinder the work. The Jews answered their enemies by telling them that what they did was by the command of Cyrus king of Persia: "then the people of the land hired counsellors against them," &c.: [see Ezra 4 : 1—3.] "In the third year of Cyrus" the news of this opposition would reach Daniel, in Persia; and this causes him to "fast three full weeks," Dan. 10 : 2, 3. At the close of this fast he had the vision afterwards recorded: and the glorious personage he saw informs him [verse 13] why he had not sooner come to him: "The prince of the kingdom of Persia"—the presiding angel there, or Cyrus himself—"withstood" his influence in behalf of the Jews "one and twenty days," or during the period of Daniel's fast, till "Michael one of the chief princes," or the angel having special charge of the Jewish nation, "came to help" him; and he [who was speaking] "remained there with the kings of Persia" that "twenty-one days," and then came to Daniel to make known to him what should "befall thy people in the latter days." If we have taken a correct view of this matter, here is strong evidence against the common idea that Michael is Christ. If our Lord is ever called an angel, it must be in regard to *office;* but Michael, as we have seen, is an angel in nature, and of that order of beings, and "one of the chief" or first among them.

We think it has already been made to appear that God manages the affairs of this world by the ministration of angels. May it not be true then that certain angels have special charge, not only of the "heirs of salvation" in particular, but of particular families, cities, states, kingdoms, and people? Our Lord taught that the persons who are accounted worthy to attain the world to come, *and* the resurrection from the dead, shall be equal unto the angels. He also taught his followers that they were to have authority over certain cities and people: see Math. 19 : 28, "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." See also Luke 19 : 15—19. Here he assures the faithful they shall have "authority over cities." In Rev. 20 : 6, we are taught that those who have part in the first resurrection shall be kings, &c., and reign with Christ the thousand years.

Michael's Special Charge.

If these things are so, may it not be true, as already intimated, that different *ranks* of angels have authority, or charge, over certain people, nations, and communities, as well as over particular individuals? We have seen the truth clearly stated they do, by comparing Gal. 3 : 19, with Acts 7 : 53, 38, and Heb. 2 : 2. Then, as the Jews were the nation first or highest in the favour of God, as the Scriptures abundantly testify, the angel who has the special oversight of that nation would be one of the first of the chief princes, or the archangel, and is declared to be Michael. He it was who had special charge of that people; and when they were trodden under foot Michael is represented as *not standing up* for them; but when the time comes for their deliverance, and the deliverance of their city, from the treading under foot by the Gentiles, Michael is represented as *standing up* for their benefit, as in Daniel 12 : 1. Here the children of Daniel's people are to be delivered, every one that is found written in the book: or, "the remnant" that escape the awful judgments of that "time of trouble."

But, *who are "Daniel's people?"* This question, it seems to us, can have but one answer to an unbiased mind. Look at the context: commence with chap. 9 : 15. "O Lord our God that hast brought *thy people* out of the land of Egypt," &c. Can any doubt what people that was? Again, verse 16, "For our sins—Jerusalem and *thy people* are become a reproach," &c. The same people still. Verse 19, "For thy city and *thy people* are called by thy name." Verse 20, Daniel says: "While I was—confessing the sin of *my people* Israel," &c. What people is this? Can there be a doubt but he is still speaking of the Jews, the posterity of Jacob? Then Gabriel tells Daniel, verse 24, "Seventy weeks are determined upon *thy people*," &c. Here we clearly have the same people—the Jews. The glorious personage that speaks to Daniel, chap. 10, verse 14, says—"I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days," &c. Where is any authority for changing to another people, here, from that spoken of previously? We think there is none at all. The same glorious personage, in chap. 11, tells Daniel, verse 14,—"The robbers of *thy people* shall exalt themselves," &c. Same people still, *viz:* the Jews, posterity of Jacob, and children of the fathers whom God brought up "out of Egypt:" chap. 9 : 15. In only one verse more does the phrase occur in this prophecy; and in that verse we are bound to apply it to the same posterity of Jacob, unless we can show a plain and scriptural reason for departing from the uniform application of the phrase to that people. No such reason, we believe exists; and therefore we feel bound to follow the sense already given to the expression by the three witnesses who have before spoken on the subject, *viz:* Daniel, Gabriel, and Christ. In the mouth of such witnesses, we should suppose, the most incredulous would be satisfied that Daniel's people are none others than Jacob's literal descendants. At a given point of time "Michael shall *stand up*, the great prince which standeth for the children of *thy people*—and at that time THY PEOPLE *shall be delivered*, every one that shall be found written in the book:" or who are *alive* after that "time of trouble." The angel who

has had that people under his special charge, and who did not utterly forsake them, [see Lev. 26 : 44,] while they and their city were "trodden down of the Gentiles," now, when "the times of the Gentiles [treading them under foot] is fulfilled," stands up for their deliverance, and they are delivered. At the same time, or in the vicinity of that time, there is to be a resurrection, and the saints, made immortal, take the kingdom under the whole heaven: a new age, or dispensation opens, elsewhere spoken of as of a thousand years continuance.

SELECTED.

THE SON OF GOD.—NO II.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIVINE TESTIMONY CONCERNING THE ORIGIN OF THE HIGHEST AND MOST GLORIOUS CHARACTER OF THE SON OF GOD.

1. *The Testimony of the Prophets and Apostles.*

Col. 1: 15-19, Who is the *image* of the invisible God, the *first-born* of every *creature:* for by him were all things created, &c ; for it *pleased the Father* that in him should all fulness dwell. Heb. 1 chap., God hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son, whom *he hath appointed* heir of all things, *by whom* also HE made the worlds, who being the brightness of his glory, and the express *image* of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, &c., being *made* so much better than the angels, &c.—And again, when he bringeth the *first begotten* into the world, *he saith,* and let all the angels of God worship him. Unto the *Son* he saith, thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, *thy* God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. John 1 : 14, And the word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory the glory as of the *only begotten of the Father,* full of grace and truth. Rev. 19 : 13, His name is called the *Word of God.* John 3 : 31, 32, He that cometh from heaven is above all. And what *he hath seen and heard* that he testifieth. 34, For he whom *God hath sent* speaketh the words of God: For God *giveth* not the spirit by measure unto him. 35, The Father loveth the Son, and hath *given* all things into his hand. 1 Cor. 11 : 3, The *head* of Christ is God. Rev. 1 : 1, The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God *gave unto him.* Acts 2 : 22, Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which *God did by him,* &c. Acts 10 : 38, *God anointed* Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who went about doing good, &c.: for *God was with him.* 1 Peter 1 : 21, God that raised him up from the dead, and *gave* him glory. Rom. 2 : 26, God shall judge the secrets of men BY Jesus Christ. Acts 10 : 42, *Ordained* of God to be the Judge of quick and dead.—Acts 17 : 31.

2. *The testimony of Jesus Christ.*

Rev. 3 : 14, These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true Witness, *the beginning of the creation of God.* John 6 : 57, I live *by the Father.* 5 : 26, For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he *given* to the Son to have life in himself, and hath *given him authority* to execute judgment, &c. Matt. 11 : 27, All things are *delivered* unto me of my Father. 28 : 18, All power is *given* unto me in heaven and in earth. John 17 : 2, As thou hast *given* him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast *given* him. John 10 : 18, I have power to lay it down; and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I *received of my Father.* John 5 : 19, Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Son *can do nothing of himself.* John 14 : 10, The Father, that dwelleth in me, *he doeth the works.* John 5 : 22, for the Father judgeth no man; but hath *committed* all judgment unto the Son; That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. John 17 : 24, Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am : that they may behold my glory *which thou hast given me;* For thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. John 17 : 5, And now, O Father, *glorify thou me* with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. John 8: 26, He that *sent me* is true; and I speak to the world those things which *I have heard of him.* John 12 : 49, For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he *gave me a commandment* what I should say, and what I should speak. John 7 : 16, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. John 6 : 38, For I came down from heaven, *not to do mine own will,* but the will of him that sent me. Luke 22 : 29, And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath *appointed unto me.* Matt. 12 : 28, but if I cast out devils *by the Spirit of God,* &c.

3. *Testimony of God the Father.*

Ps. 89 : 19, Then thou spakest in vision to thy holy one, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty. 25, I will set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. 26, He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. 27, Also I will make him my first born, higher than the kings of the earth. Ps. 2 : 7, Thou art my son : this day have I begotten thee : Isa. 42: 1, 6, Behold my servant, whom I uphold, mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth : I have put my Spirit upon him. I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant to the people, for a light to the Gentiles. Heb. 1 : 6, 9, And again, when he bringeth in the *first begotten* into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him.—Unto the *Son* he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even *thy* God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy *fellows.*

Guided by the light of heavenly truth, let us now proceed to the consideration of the following important and highly interesting question. Is Jesus Christ called God, is he worshipped, has he created the universe, is he preserver and Saviour and King and Judge, as the *self-existent, independent, omnipotent, and only true God:* or, as the *Son of God, begotten, upheld, exalted and glorified by the Father?*

Revelation alone must answer this question. Let no conclusion of imperfect reason, no false inferences of our erring minds, no prejudice in favor of our long cherished systems, prevent our receiving the divine testimony on this subject.

Let us first consider *in what sense* the Scriptures of truth apply the title of God, to Jesus Christ.

That the mere application of this title to Christ, does not prove him to be the self-existent Deity, is evident from the 82d Psalm, where we find it applied to earthly rulers. See also Exod. 7 : 1 ; 22 : 28.

John 10 : 35. From Heb. 1 : 8, it is evident that it is as the *begotten* Son, that he is called God. "Unto the *Son* he saith, thy throne, O God," &c. And in the very next verse, and in immediate connexion, the same person who is called God, is plainly represented as having a God. "Therefore God, *even thy God*," &c. See also John 20 : 17 : Rev. 3 : 12. Here, then, the Bible, which is its own best interpreter, plainly teaches us that he is not called God *in the highest sense;* for the supreme Deity can neither be *begotten* nor *have a God*.

John 1 : 1, In this passage of divine truth, it is declared that the Word, who is called God, "*was with God.*" Here also the Holy Scriptures teach us, that in whatever sense the Word is called God, he is a distinct being from the supreme God, otherwise he could not be said to be *with God* Now as it is no where expressly revealed that the Word or Son is "the same numerical essence," or the same being as the Father, how can the passage bear such a construction? We have Bible authority for saying, that the term God is sometimes used in an inferior or figurative sense; but have we any authority from Scripture or reason for saying, that the supreme God *was with the* supreme God? "To what class of men could John address the asseveration," that the supreme God was with himself? "Where did these singular heretics suppose" the supreme God was, except with himself? Is there any intelligible idea in the proposition, that the same numerical essence was with the same numerical essence? Or can we conceive that one supreme God was with another supreme God?

The Scriptures of truth afford more light on this important text In John 17 : 5, our dear Redeemer prays, "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." Here it is just as evident that *the glory of the Word cannot be the glory of the supreme Deity, as that supreme Deity cannot be a subject of prayer.* This cannot be considered the prayer of his "*human nature,*" for that nature, so far from enjoying glory "*before the world was,*" did not then exist. Our Saviour evidently refers to the state of which John wrote, John 1 : 1. The same nature prays as then existed, to be restored to the same glorious condition. Does not this conclusively prove that the Son is dependent on the Father, for the highest glory he possesses?

Rev. 19 : 13, Here we are instructed that the Word is "the Word *of God.*" Is it not the design of the Spirit of truth to teach us, by this term, that the Son is the medium of communication or manifestation of all the glory of God, (in creation, providence and redemption,) to his intelligent creatures? "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

Rom. 9 : 5, Christ—who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen. Here our precious Redeemer is again called God, over all God, which is expressive of his high authority and dominion. Compare this passage with Ps. 45 : 6, where Jesus is called God on the throne of the kingdom. In the view of this glorious character, believers love and adore him.—But whether he is possessed of this dominion, of *independent right*, or by the *pleasure and appointment of* the Father, the Scriptures must determine. Dan. 7: 13, 14, I saw in the night-visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him. And there was *given*, him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. Matt. 28 : 18, All power is *given* unto me in heaven and in earth. John 17 : 2, As thou hast *given* him power over all flesh, &c. Luke 22: 29, I *appoint* unto you a kingdom as my Father hath *appointed* unto me. Ps. 2 : 6, 8, Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. Ask of me and *I shall give thee* the heathen for thine inheritance, &c. Acts 5 : 31, Him *hath God exalted* with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins. Here we are taught that Jesus Christ executes the high offices of Prince and Saviour; that he gives repentance and forgives sin, *all by the power and appointment of the Father.*

To be over all, and to have all things under him, are synonymous expressions. "But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him."—1 Cor. 15 : 27, He is therefore dependent on another being, even the Father, for having all things under him, or being "over all." HENRY GREW.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Since the last Examiner went to press this truly wonderful man has fallen asleep; and one of the greatest ornaments of the age now slumbers in the dust of the earth. We have seen nothing concerning this great and truly good man that has interested us more than the following account of "two visits" to his mansion, last fall, by E. Chadwick, Principal of Starkey Seminary. We have no doubt it will interest all our readers. We copy from "*The Christian Palladium,*" Albany, N. Y.

It was the writer's privilege, a short time since, to hold a *religious conversation* with the venerable sage, John Quincy Adams: and I now send you a brief outline of his interesting remarks. Trembling with years and in feeble health, Mr. A.'s example in frequenting the house of God, and in the diligent perusal of the Scriptures, is worthy of all imitation.

My first visit to the venerable patriot was on a pleasant morning in August, in company with a spirited Teacher's Convention, numbering about one hundred gentlemen and ladies, from various states, who went in a body to pay their respects to Mr. A. He gave us a simple, hearty welcome to his mansion, the same plain, ancient, two-story house, which was occupied by his distinguished father.

The feeble old man, in plain dress, meets us at the door, shakes hands with all, invited us into his spacious, but now crowded parlour, kindly says he is glad to see us, wishes he had seats for us all to sit down,—is "very happy to see so many *gentlemen*, and especially happy to see so many LADIES. who are engaged in the good work of instructing the children of the country." And he playfully added, with a smile, "gentlemen, I have always found it pleasant to have the good opinion of the *men*, but still more gratifying to have the good opinion of the WOMEN."

After a few moments spent in conversation, singing, looking at the busts and portraits of Washington, and other worthies, adorning the entry and parlors, we partook of a refreshing draught of pure COLD WATER—the simple beverage which has given *him* strength for so many years,—and commending him, in our hearts, to God, we took our leave, thankful for the privilege we had enjoyed.

I spent the suceeding Sabbath at Quincy and observed that this fervent *octogenarian*, with a small and feeble frame, walked twice to meeting. His house stands about a *Sabbath-day's journey* from the *synagogue*. He walked without a cane, looked out all the hymns, *without glasses*, and stood during all the singing, and during all the prayers. So constant is he, that his neighbours remark, "If the President is not at meeting, when in town, we know he *must be sick*." His father, John Adams, belonged to the same church—that planted by the Pilgrims—and he was equally punctual. Mr. Charles Francis Adams, son of J. Q. A., and originator of the popular law for protecting fugitive slaves, is also a communicant of the same church, and seems to be walking in the same steps. Rare spectacle! three generations of illustrious men, walking in the same moral, "steady habits." All witnessed by the same town and the same church!

The day was unpleasant, and yet the large church was well filled, both forenoon and afternoon. Doubtless the punctuality is greatly owing to the example of such leading men.

Second Visit.—Mr. Adams keeps (apparently) no servants. He delights not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Call at his house, and you find he is himself as one that serves. Ring or knock, and he comes himself to the door, extends his hand, and without the least *palaver*, conducts you to a chair in the sitting room, or parlor, and treats the humblest caller as an equal. Being thus seated by him, after he had kindly made some remarks upon his health, &c., I observed to him that he was reputed to be a diligent reader of the Bible, but that, whilst his other opinions had been made so public, I had seen very little notice of his religious sentiments—the result of his long continued Bible-reading. I added, that if I was not indulging an unreasonable curiosity, and proposing an unwelcome request, I should be gratified to know what opinions he had formed upon a few points, particularly upon the character of Christ, and the Holy Spirit.

He replied, "I have never obtruded my religious views upon others; but I have no views to conceal." He said, "My practice, since I was thirty years of age, has been to read in the Bible, the first thing I do, every morning. [He has been always a very *early riser*.] "This practice I have followed with but few interruptions [for fifty years.] The versions which I have read, are (1) our common English Bible; (2) Thompson's translation of the Septuagint, a very literal translation, (he remarked); (3) the Latin Vulgate; (4) Calvin's Translation in French; (5) the Catholic translation in French; (6) Luther's translation in German; (7) the New Testament in Greek." Upon naming each of the above versions, he made interesting remarks on their character, and the slight discrepencies between them; spoke of the different chronology of the Septuagint, &c.

He continued, "These are the versions I have used. My habit has been, to read each morning, two chapters in one of these, and then the same in one of the others, comparing them together. In this way I have read them all through twice or more. Commentaries I have read not much, controversies not much. *But I have read the Bible.*" This last sentence he repeated with emphasis. He not only "*reads* the Bible," but endeavors to understand it; receives it as a revelation from God, and *believes it*. He compares, not only Scripture with Scripture, but version with version, Protestant with Catholic, ancient with modern.

Thus he has "*read the Bible.*" What views, on the great theme of revelation, has it given him?

☞ He says,—"I do not find in the Bible, a Deity of three persons. Nor do I find Christ to be the Supreme God." Says he does not conceive of the Father as strictly a *person*, but a vast Being, incomprehensible and glorious, far transcending all our thoughts of a *person*. He is revealed as our Creator, &c., referring to such passages of Scripture as Ps. 19; 1, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work."

He mentioned the three angels who came to Abraham's tent. Said he had no idea that they were the *three persons of the Godhead!* I remarked that I apprehended the word "person," was used by many in the sense of the Latin word "*persona*," from which comes our word "*personate*." But with great readiness, Mr. Adams replied that he "did not let the Catholics off so:" that their word "*persona*" meant "person"—a *human being*, or one *like* a human being. In proof of this he referred to the use of the word in Latin plays, by Terrence, Plautus, &c.; and quoted from Cicero's letters: "Contra ejus *personam* multa fecit,"—"did many things *against his person*."

Mr. A. believes strongly in the pre-existence of Christ. Says he was certainly with the Father before men were made, and before the world was. If not Paul was mistaken!—

He thinks "the Spirit is pure spirit." God, in love, moves upon the hearts of his children. The means or influence by which He does it is called his Spirit.

Mr. A. evidently has thought much on these great subjects. He has *thought for himself*. He is strongly opposed to "creeds." Says, that although an Arian, he can subscribe to no humnn creed, whether Arian, Athanasian, Socinian, Unitarian, or Trinitarian. He takes the *Bible* for his creed, and tries to believe *that*. Says there is more in that than he can comprehend; trusts he shall know more hereafter; speaks like one who now sees through a glass darkly and dimly, but earnestly desires more clear and glorious light; trusts and believes that it is in reserve for him. On the verge of the grave, he is evidently sincere and earnest. No one could listen to him, without being impressed that he is honest. He laments his littleness of knowledge; confesses it; but longs to know more of God and of heaven.

Amid all his busy cares in life, he has studied God's word in many languages; has read it through in Latin, French and German, more times than most persons have in English; and has himself made an entire metrical version of the Psalms! God be thanked for the strength that word has given to his servant, making him the fearless champion of Truth and of Right.

MERRIHEW & THOMPSON, PRINTERS, 7 CARTER'S ALLEY.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. **PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1848.** **No. 5.**

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 21 N. SIXTH STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.—NO. VII.

THE FIRST RESURRECTION.

The first question that arises, in the consideration of this subject, is, "What do we understand by the "*first resurrection*"? and the second question is, "Who will be the subjects of it?"

1. Let us attend to the first question John, in Revelation, 20th chapter, describes the following scene: "And I saw an Angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand." This "angel," or messenger, we understand to be the Messiah, "the Messenger of the Covenant," who "comes down from heaven" with "power and great glory." The Apostle continues: "And he laid hold on the dragon, that old Serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him *a thousand years*." He bound him during the Future Age, or the continuance of his reign. "And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up and set a seal upon him, that he should *deceive the nations no more*, till the thousand years should be fulfilled; and after that he must be loosed a little season." The *nations*, then, are *now* DECEIVED; but *then* their deception will be removed.

"And I saw thrones," says John, "and they sat upon them, and judgment was given to them." The Apostle saw the thrones of Messiah's Associate Kings, and those who sat upon them; and says that "*judgment* was given to them." "And I saw," says he, "the souls of them that were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and who had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; *and they lived and* REIGNED WITH CHRIST *a thousand years*. But THE REST OF THE DEAD *lived not again until the thousand years were finished.* THIS IS THE FIRST RESURRECTION. Blessed and holy is he that hath a part in the first resurrection: *on such the second death hath no power*, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

Is the "first resurrection" the *first* in fact, or the *first* in *importance*? It certainly is not the *first* in *fact*, if we consider the resurrection of Christ as a distinct one; for Jesus was "the first born from the dead"—the first fruits of them that slept." Besides, there were those who "came out of their graves," after the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ. We repeat, therefore, that, *if the resurrection of Christ be considered a separate and distinct one*, the resurrection spoken of by the Apostle John, *would not* be the *first* in *fact*. And we do not see how those who hold this view can well dispose of the difficulty. But we do not so regard the resurrection of the Messiah. We look upon his birth from the grave as a part of the "*first resurrection;*" and we think this view of the subject can be sustained by the testimony of the Scriptures.

Let the reader remember, then, that Jesus is "the *first* fruits of them that slept:" he is the *antitype* of the "first ripe sheaf which was waved before the Lord:" the "*earnest* of the *full harvest*;" "the *first born* among *many brethren*." The "first ripe sheaf" was a part of the general harvest—"the first *fruits*" of that harvest. The "*first born* among many brethren," is, nevertheless, a member of the family—a part of it; and without this *order* there could be no family; for there must necessarily be a "first born." The Apostle Paul, in the 15th chapter 1st Cor., says: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. *But every man in his own* ORDER: *Christ the* FIRST FRUITS; *afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming.*" This is the "order" of the harvest of the dead; Jesus is the "earnest of that harvest"—the "FIRST BORN *from among the dead.*" He, therefore, stands at the head, and as a part of "*the first resurrection.*"

From this view of the subject, we regard the "first resurrection," of the Apostle John, as the harvest of which the Messiah was "the first fruits"—the "first ripe sheaf."

As it respects those, who "came out of their graves," after the resurrection of Christ, as well as others which might be mentioned, it is very doubtful whether they arose "to die no more;" and, consequently, if they did not, they would not constitute any part of the "harvest." It will be perceived, then, that we regard the "first resurrection" as the *first in fact*, in the sense in which we have explained it. The "first resurrection," therefore, is not only the *first* in point of *fact*, but, also, in *importance*.

2. The next question is, "*Who will be the subjects of the first resurrection?*"

This is one of the most important questions that can engage our attention; and the reader will excuse us for enlarging upon it.

Some suppose that, when the Lord comes, *all the dead* will be raised; but it must be obvious to the most unlearned in the Scriptures, that this view would conflict with the idea of a "first resurrection" at all. There are to be *two* resurrections: the "*first*" when the Lord comes, (he being regarded as the "first fruits" of it;) the *second* "when he shall deliver up the kingdom to

God, even the Father, that He may be all and in all." All the dead, therefore, will not be raised at the second advent of Messiah.

From the paragraph, quoted from Revelation, we learn that the martyrs, or those that had "been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." These, therefore, will be raised from the dead; they will have a part in the "first resurrection."

After speaking of the "sealing" of the hundred and forty-four thousand of the tribes of Israel, John says: "After this I beheld, and lo, a *great multitude* which no man could number, of all *nations*, and *kindreds*, and *people*, and *languages*, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, salvation to our God who sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb." Rev. vii. 9, 10. Again, in the 14th verse, these persons are said to have come "out of *great tribulation*, and have *washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.* THEREFORE *they are before the throne of God*, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne will dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb who is in the midst of the throne will feed them, and will lead them to living fountains of waters: and God will wipe away all tears from their eyes."

Here we behold an innumerable multitude of Saints, from every nation, kindred, people, and language, standing before the throne. They have come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. And for this reason, they stand before the Lamb, and all tears are wiped from their eyes. In as much, then, as these are to enjoy "the rest that remains for the people of God," in the Age to come, they will be subjects of the "first resurrection." Moreover, the persons represented by the symbols of the "four beasts," and "four-and-twenty elders," are described as singing "a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals of it: for thou wast slain, and hast *redeemed* us to God by thy *blood* out of every *kindred*, and *language*, and *people*, and *nation;* and hast made us to our God kings and priests: AND WE SHALL REIGN ON THE EARTH." Ch. v. 9, 10.

The destiny of these persons, thus redeemed by the blood of Christ, is to reign with Messiah on the earth. They will, therefore, have a part in the "first resurrection;" otherwise they could not *reign with him.*

Again, it is said: "Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, *and they also that pierced him:* and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." Ch. 1: 7. If those who "pierced him" behold him, as he descends from heaven, they must, also, be raised from the dust of death. But this may only refer to the *Jews*, as *such*, because it is written by one of the Prophets—"and they shall look upon him whom they *pierced*, and mourn for him," &c.

We now state a proposition, which, perhaps, may startle some, and extort the cry of heresy from others; but, which, nevertheless, we regard as *Scriptural; viz.*: THAT NOT A SINGLE GENTILE WILL BE A SUBJECT OF THE "FIRST RESURRECTION," EXCEPT THE SAINTS FROM AMONG THE GENTILES. We find no evidence in the Scriptures to lead us to believe, that any, from among the Gentiles, will be raised from the dead, *at the coming of Christ*, EXCEPT THOSE "WHO HAVE WASHED THEIR ROBES, AND MADE THEM WHITE IN THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB."

The "first resurrection" will be eminently *Jewish.* It will embrace *two classes*—"*the children of Abraham by faith*," and his *literal* descendants. There will not only be *two classes*, but *two "orders;"* first the "*tares*," second, the "*wheat.*" The "*tares*," although gathered *at* the "*harvest*," are not a *part* of that "*harvest.*" They "grow together *until* the harvest, and are then gathered to be consumed." They are not *of* the "first fruits," and consequently are not *numbered* in the "first resurrection." They do not belong to this *class*—they are not of this *order.*

We have said that the "first resurrection" will be *Jewish;* and now let us hear the testimony of Daniel: "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. *And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.*" Ch. xii. 1, 2.

The *point* in this prediction to which we wish to direct the special attention of the reader, is, that when Michael the great Prince—the Messiah—stands up for the children of Daniel's people, every one found written in the book shall be delivered; and that *many* of *them* (of Daniel's people) that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, *some* (of Daniel's people) to *everlasting life*, and *some* (of Daniel's people) *to shame and everlasting contempt.*"

It is evident, apart from the judgment of the nations indicated in the prophecy, that *Daniel's people* is the subject of this prediction; and that the resurrection spoken of is the resurrection of "his people"—of Jews only, without even the slightest allusion to the Abrahamic seed from among the Gentiles.

We regard this prediction, then, as relating exclusively to two classes among Daniel's people, and as having no reference to the Gentiles, whether *Saints* or otherwise.

Regarding it then in this light, we find that ALL *the Jews will not be raised* at the time indicated: for the Prophet says MANY *of them that sleep in the dust shall awake.*" "*Many* shall awake;" not all. This "many" comprises two classes—the "*wheat*" and the "*tares*"—the "*chaff*" and the "*wheat.*" The chaff and the wheat, though gathered at the same time, share not the same destiny; the one is burned—the other is gathered into the garner of the Lord. So, in the case before us, "some arise to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." An objector may say, that the resurrection of two classes at the same time, clashes with the declaration of the Apostle John—"*Blessed* and *holy* is he that hath a part in the first resurrection; on *such* the *second death hath no power.*"

We reply that the "tares" are not considered as a part of the "harvest"—they are not identified with those who constitute the "first resurrection."

Now let us see if the view we have taken of this subject, harmonizes with other testimonies.

Matthew vii. 22, 23: "Many," said Jesus, "will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, *have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name done many wonderful works?* And then will I profess to them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." Here we have the awful prediction, that "many" persons, doubtless contemporary Jews, who perhaps, like Judas, may have wrought miracles in the name of Christ, will be raised from the dead, when the Messiah shall be revealed from heaven, and commanded to depart from his presence! This view of the subject is strengthened by the following: "And I say to you, that *many* (Gentile saints) shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. But *the children of the kingdom* (some of the Jews—the rebellious) shall be cast out into utter darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." Chapter viii. 11, 12.

These Israelites, who rejected the Messiah, will be raised from their slumbers in the dust of death, only to behold "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all the Prophets in the Kingdom of God; and themselves thrust out! And then they will be the subjects of "weeping and gnashing of teeth."

This harmonizes with the testimony of Paul in his letter to the Hebrews, when he speaks of a "*sorer punishment*" as the reward of *apostacy*. The Hebrews were strongly tempted to this sin, and hence the propriety of the Apostle's warning.

The sum of the whole matter, then, is this "The first resurrection" embraces the *Saints of all ages* —the *true Israel* of God—the *children of promise*. But the wicked and Apostate Jews will also be raised, not to life, but "to shame and everlasting contempt." The rest of the Gentile world will not be raised until the "thousand years are finished." *Then* the dead, small and great, will come forth; the sea will give up its dead; and death and hell yield up their victims; and all will stand before God!

J. T. W.

PHILOSOPHY OF MAN.—NO. IV.

By J. T. Walsh.

THE HUMAN SPIRIT.

We have seen that the term soul, when used in reference to man, signifies: 1. Life. 2. Person. 3. A dead body. 4. Mind. 5. It is used to personify. 6. For being or existence. We are now prepared to examine the term spirit. Solomon says, 'who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth.' Eccle. iii. 21. Although, then, we have said, upon the authority of Scripture, that both beasts and men have spirits, we are not to be understood as saying, that a beast has a human mind; but simply that both have spirits.

1. The term spirit signifies breath. James ii. 26: 'For as the body without the spirit [breath] is dead,' &c. 'God made man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath [or spirit] of life, and he became a living soul.'

2. It is used as the vital principle, life. Luke viii. 55: 'And her spirit [her life, her vitality, her breath] came again, and she arose immediately,' &c. Job xxxix. 14: If he [God] should set his heart upon man, if he should gather to himself his spirit [his life] and his breath, all flesh would perish together, and man would turn to dust again.' This text proves that God gathers to himself the breath of man, and enables us to understand the language of Solomon when he says, 'Then shall the spirit [life or breath] return to God who gave it.' 'Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit [of life] shall return to God who gave it.' Eccle. xii. 7. God made man's body, with all its parts, out of the dust, and then endowed it with life. This was from God; and when a man dies, his spirit, or life, returns to God who gave it. Ps. xxxi. 5: 'Into thy hand I commit my spirit; [my life, my being;] thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of truth.' Christ said, when he was about to expire, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit,' my life. Luke xxiii. 46. Stephen said, 'Lord Jesus receive my spirit,' life. Acts vii. 59. Christ is the Christian's life, and when Christ, who is their life, shall appear they will also appear with him in glory.

3. It is used for the mind of man. Gen. xxvi. 35: 'Who were a bitterness of spirit [of mind] to Isaac and Rebecca.' Their minds were grieved—they were disturbed. Chapter xli. 8: 'And it came to pass in the morning that his spirit [his mind] was troubled.' Chapter xlv. 27: 'The spirit of Jacob their father revived.' His mind, which before was cast down or dejected, now revived and became cheerful. Ex. vi. 9: 'They harkened not to Moses, by reason of anguish of spirit,' of mind. Job xxxiii. 8: 'But there is a spirit, a mind, in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding.' Eccle. iii. 21: 'Who knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth.' This text is susceptible of two expositions, and we will submit them both, and let you judge of their correctness. 1. It may refer to the mind; and then its meaning will be, who knoweth the mind of man that goeth upward; that is, ascending, towering, exalted, and exalting, and the spirit, or mind, of the beast that goeth downward to the earth; that is, earthly in its nature, and cannot rise above the things of time and sense. But the context favours this view more than the preceding one, who knows the spirit, or life, of man that goeth upward to God, and that will, consequently, be given back to him again; and the spirit, or life, of the beasts that goeth downward to the earth, and, consequently, perishes? This view of the matter would only prove that man would be raised from the dead; but, that the beasts would not. In this exposition we see the force and propriety of the expression, 'the beasts that perish;' that is, are not raised from the dead.

4. It stands for the thoughts, affections, care, temper, frame or disposition of mind. 1 Tim. iv. 12: 'Be thou an example of believers in spirit;' in temper, disposition, &c. Col. ii. 5: 'Though I be absent in the flesh, yet I am with you in spirit.' Ps. li. 10: 'Renew a right spirit within me;' a right disposition, temper, &c. 'If any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his.' If any man have not the disposition of Christ, &c.

5. It is used for person. Mark ii. 8: 'When Jesus perceived in his spirit;' in himself, or in his mind. Luke i. 47: 'And my spirit hath rejoiced in God, my Saviour;' I have rejoiced, &c. 2 Thes. ii. 2. 1 John iv. 1: 'Beloved, believe not every spirit; but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets, or spirits, have gone out into the world.' See 2d and 3d verses. 1 Peter iii. 19: 'By which, spirit, also he went and preached to the

spirits, or persons, in prison.' These spirits, or persons, were said to be disobedient in the days of Noah. 1 Cor. v. 5: 'To deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit, the person, the man himself, may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.'

6. It is used in reference to men translated to heaven or raised from the dead. Heb. xii. 23: 'To the spirits of just men made perfect, &c., &c. Alluding to those, perhaps, that were translated to heaven, and to those who were raised from the dead after our Lord arose. Much more could be said on this, and, indeed, on all the above propositions, but this will suffice to give a correct interpretation of the term spirit.

We will conclude this part of our subject by making a few remarks more on spirit. That there is a spiritual essence pervading the whole animal, and particularly the blood and nervous system, carrying vitality, life, and power to every part of the human frame, and evolving thought, and feeling, by means of the brain, which is its grand sensorium, we have already proved. And it is probable that Solomon alludes to this, when he says: 'As thou knowest not what is the way of the spirit, nor the structure of the parts of conception in her that is with child,' &c. Eccle. ii. 5. Recent discoveries in Physiology clearly show, that while the brain is the instrument of thought, of the mind, there is something, whose nature, at least, is semi-spiritual, which operates upon, and moves the brain, and gives life, power, and mental energy. There is an essence which pervades the nervous system, although we cannot see it, or weigh it; although it is not tangible to our senses, yet we are convinced that it is there by actual experiment. And the science of Neurology is bringing to light some astounding facts and truths upon this subject. So, we find no difficulty in admitting and maintaining that man has a spirit. But it is one thing to prove that man has a spirit, and quite another to prove that the spirit is immortal. The evidence of the one is not the evidence of the other. The proof of one is not the proof of the other. The testimony of one is not the testimony of the other. They are two distinct propositions. And if every text in the Bible, in which the term spirit is used in reference to man, means spirit, literal spirit, and nothing else but spirit, the proposition that man has an immortal soul, or an immortal spirit, would not be sustained. It is one thing to prove that man has a spirit, and another to prove that that spirit must necessarily be immortal. If we wish to prove that the existence of God would never terminate, we would not argue this fact upon the hypothesis that he was spiritual, and, therefore, could not cease to be: but we would appeal to the word of God, which says, he is 'immortal;' that he 'alone has immortality.' If we wished to prove that the angels would live forever, we would not predicate by arguments upon their being spirits, but upon some positive declaration of the Holy Scriptures. Let it, then, be distinctly understood, that when our opponents, on the subject of immortality, have proved that man has a spirit, they have not began to prove that spirit immortal. We hope, therefore, that those Phrenologists who teach that man has an immortal soul, or an immortal spirit, will observe this just, logical, and scriptural distinction; and, hereafter, direct their attention, as well as their testimony, to the proper point, and not confound wisdom by words without knowledge. But, in this discussion, it is taken for granted that because man has a spirit, that spirit cannot die; that it is immortal. Now, we do not ask them to prove that man has a soul and a spirit, but we do ask them to prove that either the one or the other, or both, is immortal. For they do not inform us which is, positively, the immortal part; but, sometimes speak of an 'immortal soul;' and then of a 'deathless spirit?' Has man two immortal principles within?

But, how do religionists attempt to prove that the spirit of man cannot die? 'Why,' say they, 'God is a spirit, and cannot die. This does not come in one thousand leagues of proving it. They first assume that the spirit of man, and the spirit of God are the same in essence, or rather that it is a part and parcel of God himself, and then infer that it cannot die. This is an assumption. The idea itself is blasphemous! It is the offspring of pride. Who has taught man that he has any divinity in him? Pagan Philosophy. Man's spirit is the seat of all his passions, propensities, &c.; No. There is no truth in it. It is a pagan fable. There is not another being in the universe of the same essence of the Deity! Where did this idea originate? Here is its origin: The Greeks and Romans thought they had descended from the gods, and consequently must have some divinity about them. And this idea was dressed up by their ancient poets and philosophers, and handed down to us in the form of an immortal soul. There are various sorts or kinds of spirits. 1. God is a spirit. 2. Angels are spirits. 3. Man has a spirit. 4. Animals have spirits. The scriptures ascribe a soul, spirit, and heart to God; but who would think of teaching that they were of the same essence of the soul, spirit, and heart of man? Who would think of contending that, because the beasts have spirits, they cannot die; that they are immortal? No person, perhaps, but a simpleton; and yet there is as much logic and sound sense in this doctrine as in the other. In a word, we might as well contend that the flesh of birds, beasts, fishes, insects, &c., was the same kind of flesh, including that of man, although the Apostle Paul distinguishes them, as to contend that all spirits were the same.

H. GREW'S RESPONSE TO DR. THOMAS.

Dr. Thomas remarks: "It does not necessarily follow, that if a man be not saved, he is therefore consigned to the lake of fire, which is the second death. *It is written* 'Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world (*aion*, age or dispensation) nor in that to come,' Matt. 12: 32. Does not this imply that there are some offences, whether of omission or commission, that will be forgiven in the future age?"

I reply, that the passage, whether it imports that those who commit this sin in the present age, shall not be forgiven in it or the future; or that the sin shall not be forgiven whether committed in this age or the future, (in which, although righteousness shall generally be established, some will die an hundred years old accursed, Isa. 65: 20,) it does not *necessarily* imply that any thing more than that this sin shall never be forgiven. It is therefore an inadequate basis for the opinion that men dying in impenitence will ever be forgiven. I understand our Lord, John 8: 21, to connect dying in sin with eternal separation from himself,—"ye

shall seek me, and shall die in your sins: whither I go, ye cannot come."

Dr. T. asks, "Is there no alternative to the resurrected between possessing the kingdom and being destroyed in the lake of fire?" It appears from the divine testimony that there is not. The names of all the human family are either written or not written in the Book of life. From Rev. 20: 27, we learn that all those whose names are therein written, will enter the kingdom, and from Rev. 20: 15, we learn that all whose names are not written there, will be cast into the lake of fire.

"The scriptures teach the *non-resurrection* of millions." I ask where? Where, I ask the learned Dr., is his scriptural authority for rejecting the literal import of our Lord's words, John 5: 28. "ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth" &c. "There shall be a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust." Rom 2, teaches, that "*in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ*," he will render to *every man* according to his deeds, "*every soul* of man that doeth evil, and *every man* that worketh good." It is true indeed that "where there is no vision the people perish:" the apostle, however, plainly teaches that those who have sinned without law (i. e. written law) will be judged "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," which necessarily implies their resurrection. "It is appointed unto all men once to die, but after this the judgment." Heb. 9: 27. If indeed, we have any plain positive declarations that some of the human family will never be raised from the dead, we must understand these universal terms in a limited sense, but not otherwise. Will the Dr. favor us with the chapter and verse? On No. 2 and 4 I remark, most cordially do I agree with Mr. T. in respect to the faith of those who "cry 'Lord, Lord,'" who do not "believe his doctrine or obey his voice." Without holiness "no man shall see the Lord." But he affirms that a man "cannot be saved in any sense, unless he also believe the *prophetic truths* concerning the kingdom of God." He also maintains "that a correct belief of doctrine and facts, with repentance, immersion and holiness, are indivisibly essential to salvation in the kingdom of God." I reply, 1. Dr. T. has not produced any scripture proof that "a correct belief of doctrine and facts," and "prophetic truths," &c., or that immersion is essential to salvation. 2. We have scriptural truth and fact to the contrary. In 1 Cor. 8: we find the person whose views of the unity of God and of idols were incorrect, recognized as a Christian brother, v. 11. Rom. 14: 1, proves that persons may be "in the faith" of the Son of God, and, consequently, be in a state of salvation, and yet be "*weak*" i. e. *erroneous* or *ignorant* in respect to some truths. Being weak is contrasted with having knowledge. 1. Cor. 8: 7, 11. In the various passages which state particularly the characters which have no inheritance in the Kingdom of God, the *unimmersed* are never mentioned. It is an undeniable fact, although immersion is the duty of every believer, and consequently, he who is immersed is more "acceptable to God," all other things being equal, than he who is not immersed; there are many real Christians who are *unimmersed*, who, *on the whole*, are more conformed to Jesus Christ, and, consequently, are more "acceptable to God," than many real Christians who are immersed.

3. If a correct belief of all scripture "doctrine and facts" and "prophetic truth," is essential to salvation; if, as the Dr. affirms, "we must believe *the whole* truth, or, be dashed to atoms," I ask, "Who then can be saved?" Highly as I esteem the biblical knowledge of Mr. T., I assure him that his opinion should make him tremble for his own safety. Has he a "correct" knowledge and "belief" of all "prophetic truth?" Does he discern accurately all things which all the prophets have foretold concerning the Kingdom of God, and the true periods of their fulfilment? If so, I think he may more truthfully adopt the words, "*I only am left*," than did the prophet of old. For the sake of poor humanity, however, I rejoice in the assurance that he would be vastly further from the truth, than number one is from "seven thousand." The Editor of the Examiner well observes, "If we believed to constitute a man a real Christian, he must be perfect in knowledge and judgment, we should never hope to find a Christian on earth, till the next age shall come."

In Dr. T.'s No. 3 he remarks, "One error is as fatal to a man's salvation as a multitude of errors believed." This, as a general proposition, is inadmissible. Whether one error is so or not, depends upon the *nature* of it. It is not the *number* but the *character* of a man's errors which determines their consequence in respect to his salvation. To substitute my own merit for the foundation God has laid in Zion for salvation, is "fatal;" but neither "one," or a hundred errors, respecting some "prophetic truths," is so. The word of truth teaches the fatal consequence of the former, but not of the latter.

On No. 6 it is observed that "the gospel is made up of particular truths." The question is asked, "Which of those particular truths have we authority to dispense with as unnecessary to salvation?" I answer, such "of these particular truths," as the bible itself does not make necessary to salvation. It is an undeniable fact that the bible recognizes among the saved, some who are "weak," or in error, respecting some "particular truths." It is equally a fact, that it declares some errors to be fatal to salvation. We may well expect then to find a marked line between these two classes of errors. So it is. Those errors of faith and practice, with those principles, which exclude men from the holy kingdom of God, are plainly declared to be thus fatal. See 1 Cor. 6: 9, 10, Rev. 22: 15. Unbelievers and immoral men are excluded, but the unimmersed and those who have not "a correct belief" of "prophetic truth" are not; consequently, no man has authority to exclude them. It is indeed our duty and privilege to occupy our talents and opportunities in seeking after all the truth of God.

On No. 11, I have only to remark, that the person whom "the apostle John forbid the true believer" to receive, &c., was one of those "*who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*," 2 John 7: and not one who believes that he has thus come, and, in the flesh, died for our sins, but does not understand and believe the truth that he actually and really suffered and died *in respect to his highest and divine nature*.

John Wesley justly remarked: "We may die without the knowledge of many truths, and be carried to Abraham's bosom; but if we die without

love, what will knowledge avail us? Just as much as it avails the devil and his angels."

"All seeing God! 'tis thine to know
The springs whence wrong opinions flow!
To judge, from principles within,
When frailty errs, and when we sin."

HENRY GREW.

THE PROPHETIC PERIODS.—NO. VII.

THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY DAYS.

By many, who have written on this subject, it has been supposed that the 1260 years of the "little horn," Dan. 7th, must have commenced A. D. 538. It must be confessed that that point, when taken in connection with the events of 1798, seemed, beyond a doubt, the true one; but time has demonstrated it to be an error. Some, we trust, are now prepared calmly to review the whole matter, on this topic, and to follow the truth wherever it shall lead, without allowing previous opinions to control their judgments.

Let us look at Daniel 7th, and see *at what point the "time, times, and the dividing of time" ends.* Can it be said to *end* till "the time" comes for "the saints" to possess "the kingdom?" We *think not.* This horn "made war with the saints and prevailed against them, *until* the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom;" verses 21, 22. *Now, so long as this horn makes war with the saints, and prevails against them, so long they must be "in his hands;" and this is expressly said to be "until the Ancient of days came—and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom."* It must be manifest, to the unprejudiced mind, that neither of those events have yet taken place: and as a certain consequence, the "time, times and the dividing of time" is not yet ended, and therefore, could not have commenced at an earlier period than 1260 years ago, or earlier than 588. It is admitted by the same writers, of whom we have been speaking, that the "*forty two months,*" Rev. 13: 5, is the same period, and covering the same ground and subject, as the little horn, Dan. 7th. Now, it is expressly said of the beast, Rev. 13: 5, that—"Power was given him to CONTINUE forty two months." The *continuance* of a power is the *whole period* of *existence* of that power. If it be said, "The marginal reading is to '*make war*' forty two months,"—that view will only strengthen my argument, for, in Daniel it is said he shall make war *until the Ancient of days comes,* &c. In whatever light, then, the subject is viewed, the 1260 years are not yet ended, nor will they end till the fourth beast of Dan. 7th, which bears this little horn, is "slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame." Then the time has come that the saints possess the kingdom. As that time has not yet arrived we are to look for the commencement of the 1260 years some where subsequent to 588.

We wish, after the experience of the past, to speak without positiveness as to any given year in which that period commenced. *If, however, we are to look for the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome as the point at which to commence, he could not have had that supremacy as late as* 590. "Bower's History of the Popes," printed in "*London,* 1750, is before us. Bower was "Public Professor of Rhetoric, History, and Philosophy, in the Universities of Rome, Fermo and Macerata; and in the latter place Counsellor of the Inquisition." Here then we may expect correct information.

Bower informs us, Vol. 2, page 459, *that the "Emperor Mauricius" assembled a "Council of the Patriarchs, all the Senators of the Imperial City, and the Metropolitans:" that, "By this great Council was confirmed to John of Constantinople, the Title of Universal Bishop, to be enjoyed by him, and his successors in that See." Bower adds—"I say confirmed, for the Bishop of Constantinople had long before this time a lawful claim to that Title."* Here is evidence that the Bishop of Rome was not Universal Bishop up to this period, 588. It is true that this transaction at Constantinople stirred up the rage of the *Bishop of Rome,* and he *called* upon the former to "*renounce the Title which he had usurped in the pride of his heart, at the instigation of the devil, to the great debasement of the rest of his brethren.*" Shortly after, the Bishop of Rome died, and was succeeded by "*Gregory the Great,*" *in* 590. Gregory, at the time of his election, was evidently, for the times in which he lived, a good man, and it was a source of great distress to him to be called to occupy the post of Bishop of Rome.

As late as 596, Pope Gregory declared that the Title of Universal Bishop was "*scandalous, profane, blasphemous*"—and that "*whoever calls himself* UNIVERSAL BISHOP, *or desires to be so called, in the Pride of his Heart, is the* FORERUNNER *of Anti-Christ.*" Bower, Vol. 2, page 515. Could he at the same time, himself, have been a Universal Bishop, or exercising the functions of such an office? I think these facts are sufficient to establish the point, that, up *to this time,* the Bishop of Rome had neither claimed nor used the prerogative of a Universal Bishop. If others had sometimes *called him so,* that does not at all affect the question: he clearly never had been such *in fact* down to 596.

Gregory, like most other men raised to high offices in the church, became corrupted; and towards the last of his life manifested the spirit of devils more than the spirit of Christ, which seemed to characterize him at first: and it is truly painful to see the change that came over him in his controversy with the Bishop of Constantinople.

In the month of November, 601, "The Emperor *Mauricius* was driven from the throne, and inhumanly murdered, and one *Phocas,* a Centurion, raised to the Empire in his room." Bower, Vol. 2, page 529. "*Mauricius* had given no particular provocation to *Phocas,* who was quite unknown to him, and yet the tyrant, not satisfied with putting him to death, for his greater torment and grief, ordered five of his sons to be first inhumanly murdered before his face. Such a scene of unparalleled cruelty drew sighs and tears from all the spectators, but *Mauricius* himself, who beheld the death of his children quite undisturbed, without shedding a tear, or betraying the least mark of grief or concern. During the whole time of that tragedy, the most shocking to the eyes of a parent that was ever beheld, he continued, in appearance, quite unaffected, only repeating, as each of his children received the fatal blow—*Just art Thou, O Lord, and Righteous are all thy Judgments. Mauricius* was beheaded last, and their heads were all brought to Constantinople and cast into a heap

near the Tribunal, where they lay till they became offensive, then the Tyrant [*Phocas*] suffered them to be buried." Bower, Vol. 2, page 531.

We have given this extract for two reasons—*First*, to show the wicked character of *Phocas*, who is hereafter to establish the *supremacy* of the Bishop of Rome: and, *Second*, to show how Gregory the Great had apostatised from the spirit that characterized him at his election. After Phocas had manifested his horrible depravity and cruelty towards Mauricius and his family, Gregory wrote him a letter, in which he says—"We have been hitherto most grievously afflicted; but the Almighty has chosen you, and placed you on the Imperial Throne, to banish, by your *merciful disposition*, all our afflictions and sorrows. Let the heavens, therefore rejoice, let the earth leap for joy; let the people return thanks for so *happy* a change." Bower, Vol. 2, page, 533. In the same letter Gregory says—"*May the Holy Ghost* that DWELLS IN YOUR BREAST, *ever guide and assist you.*" ! ! ! *Phocas* commenced *seeking the favour of Gregory, Bishop of Rome, because his wickedness* did not meet with favour from the *Bishop of Constantinople*, who opposed his murderous projects against the family of Mauricius. "The Empress *Constantina*, and her three daughters, had fled for refuge to one of the churches of Constantinople. Phocas ordered them to be taken by force and publicly executed. But they found in the Patriarch *Cyriacus*, a kind friend and protector, who opposing with great resolution and courage, the execution of the order, would suffer no kind of violence to be offered them in their asylum." Bower, Vol. 2, page 537. From that time *Phocas* conceived a hatred of the Bishop of Constantinople, which the Bishop of Rome took the advantage of to gratify his own envy and hatred; hence he flattered the bloodthirsty tyrant, Phocas, and extolled him almost to a God. Gregory died in 604, on the 12th of March. If Phocas conferred on him the *Title* of Universal Bishop, Bower has not recorded it: though it appears that he took every opportunity to oppress the Bishop of Constantinople and exalt the Bishop of Rome. On the 13th of September, the same year that Gregory died, *Sabinian* was chosen to fill the vacancy of Bishop of Rome. He proved to be a wicked, avaricious, and cruel wretch, and was hated by the *Roman* people. He died, or was killed, Feb. 22d, 606. He was succeeded by *Boniface* III. His election, Bower supposes, was not till about one year after the death of Sabinian; yet he says, "no writer accounts for" so long "a vacancy." It is possible that the defect may be in the date of his election; and that it should have been 606 instead of 607.

With respect to Boniface, I shall give a copious extract from Bower, Vol. 2, page 545. "Boniface was a Deacon of the Roman Church; was a native of Rome, and sent by Gregory, in the year 603, to Constantinople, with the character of his *Nuncio* [*Envoy or Messenger*] to congratulate, in his name *Phocas* on his accession to the Imperial Crown. Upon the death of Gregory he returned to Rome: and Sabinian, dying soon after his return, he was chosen to succeed him, as one who was not only well known to *Phocas*, but greatly favoured both by him and his wife; for by flattering the usurper, as Gregory had done, and conniving at his cruelties, if not applauding him in them, while the rest of mankind exclaimed against him as an outrageous Tyrant, he had so insinuated himself into his good graces, as to become one of his chief favourites, or his *only* favorite, being the only person in the whole city of Constantinople, who approved, or could so dissemble as to make the tyrant believe that he approved of his conduct. For that merit alone Boniface was chosen; and though he enjoyed his new dignity but a short time, for he did not even live to the end of the year in which he was raised to it, yet it may truly be said, that to him alone the *Roman See* owes more than to all his predecessors together. For he no sooner found himself vested with the Papal Dignity, than, taking advantage of the partiality and favour of Phocas to him, and of his aversion and hatred to the Patriarch *Cyriacus*, he not only prevailed on the Tyrant to revoke the Decree, settling the Title of *Universal Bishop* on the Bishop of *Constantinople*, but obtained what no man could have believed could have ever come into the thoughts of a *successor* of *Gregory* to demand, were it not vouched by all the historians to a man, and obtained a new *decree*, settling on himself and successors, that very *Title*, which his immediate Predecessor but one, and *all his Predecessors*, the best and greatest, had so often condemned in any Bishop whatever, and rejected with the utmost abhorrence, when offered to himself, as *vain, proud profane, impious, execrable, blasphemous, anti-christian, heretical, diabolical*. *Boniface* could not but know that the controverted title had been thus stigmatised over and over again, by two of his Predecessors successively, *Pelagius* II. and *Gregory*. But so inconceivably great was his ambition, so utterly unbridled was his desire of exalting his See, that rather than let slip the favourable opportunity that now offered of raising it higher than it had ever yet been, or, in the opinion of his predecessors, ought ever to be, he chose to stand condemned, out of their mouths, as a *Heretic*, a follower of satan—a rival of satan in pride—and the forerunner of anti-Christ. The Edict issued by Phocas on this occasion has not reached our times; but that thereby the Decree of the Council of Constantinople in 588, entailing the Title of Universal Bishop on the Bishop of Constrntinople, and his successors was revoked and annulled; that the said Title was transferred from them to Boniface, and his successors, and the Bishop of Rome declared the HEAD OF THE WHOLE CATHOLIC CHURCH, is what all the historians, whom I have quoted above, unanimously vouch. In the Bishop of Constantinople, the Title of Universal Bishop is generally thought to have been no more than a *badge of honor*, or an honorary title, without any accession of power. And it does not appear, that in virtue of that Title, he ever exercised or claimed any. But Boniface had scarce obtained it when he took upon him to exercise an answerable jurisdiction and power—a jurisdiction *to that time* [606 or 607]] UNKNOWN and UNHEARD OF *in the Catholic Church*. No sooner was the Imperial Edict, vesting him with the title of Universal Bishop, and declaring him *Head of the Church*, brought to Rome, than he assembled a Council in the Basilic of St. Peter, consisting of 72 Bishops, 34 Presbyters, and all the Deacons, and Inferior Clergy of that city: he acted there as if he had not been invested with the *title alone*, but with all the POWER of an *Universal Bishop*—with all the AUTHORITY of a SUPREME HEAD; or, rather, ABSOLUTE MONARCH of the

Church. By a Decree which he issued in that Council, it was pronounced, declared and defined that no election of a Bishop should thenceforth be deemed lawful and good, unless made by the *people and clergy*, approved by the *Prince* or *Lord of the City*, and CONFIRMED BY THE POPE interposing his authority in the following terms:—"*WE WILL AND COMMAND.*" Thus was the power of the Pope, as *Universal Bishop*—as *Head of the Church*, or, in other words, the *Papal Supremacy*, first introduced."

Such appears to be the true history of Papal Supremacy. *Whatever may be said of the acts of Justinian in* 533 *to* 541, *it is clear no Bishop of Rome claimed or exercised that power till the period brought to view by Bower, as briefly presented in the foregoing extracts.* Now, unless the Papal Supremacy can be dated from the decree of the Council at Constantinople, 588, which is not at all probable, there is no point of time short of 604 to 607 for it. From that point 1260 years carry us to 1864 to 1867, as the time when Papacy is to meet the "Judgment" of the "Ancient of days" and "*the time*" comes "for the saints to possess the kingdom." We repeat what we have before said—the *termination* of the 1260 years marks the *sum total* of the *existence* of the "little horn," Dan. 7th, and not 45 years *before*. It will be "destroyed," and there ends its "time, times and dividing of time." We are satisfied that those who take any other view of the subject are doomed to be disappointed.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, MAY, 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*"—*Bible.*

VISIT TO MILVILLE.—The Editor of the Examiner spent eight days at Milville, New Jersey, during the month of April. He left this city at eight o'clock, A. M., passed down the Delaware Bay by steamboat, some sixty or seventy miles to the mouth of the Cohansey River; thence up that river twenty miles to Bridegton; then ten miles by stage, arriving at the place of destination at six o'clock, P. M.; preached the same evening, and each successive evening during his stay, and three times on the Sabbath. He was most cordially received and entertained by Brother Jacob Johnson, who was formerly a Methodist Preacher, and much esteemed in the Methodist E. Church in that place, till he embraced the Scripture doctrines of the end of the wicked and sleep of the dead: finding he could not live in peace in that Church, he withdrew from it. His house has ever been a home for Preachers, and no good man, we should think, need feel any otherwise than at home there. Brother Chester, also once an Exhorter in the Methodist E. Church, is of like mind with Brother Johnson. The cry of "*Infidel*," &c., was raised against them and others who avowed their faith in the Bible truth—"all the wicked will God *destroy*"—and that "the dead praise not the Lord." These brethren had desired the Editor of the Examiner to visit them for some months past, and the opposers began to think he would be among the things that are not *present*; but he came upon them in an hour they were not aware. He had a most candid hearing from those who were not too bigoted to hear; and there were many that did hear. The last evening, by special request, he addressed the "young men of Milville." The house was literally overflowing, and numbers could not get in. The things of the Kingdom of God were presented to their minds, and the high honour God designed to place upon them if they would make those things their *first* choice. After a discourse of nearly an hour and a half, the Lord's Supper was eaten by such as had a mind thereto, preceded by some remarks on what constituted a church, and by what authority each person partakes of the Supper. This closed up the labours of that campaign. The good effected remains to be seen. If we were to do like some others who describe the glories of their labours by the excitement and appearances *at the time* of their visits, we might conclude that "*the cause*" received a powerful impetus at Milville. Some attended the meetings throughout that never visit other places of worship—some who have been skeptical, were led to say they never saw the Bible in this light before. Universalists confessed their foundations were all broken up; and such reading their Bibles, and "searching the Scriptures," it was said, had "not been seen in Milville for twenty years." We are aware, however, that the excitement produced by the presentation of truths which before lay hid from the mind, or by the labours of a minister on an occasional visit, is not evidence that the ultimate results will be what the friends of truth may desire or hope. Herod heard John the Baptist "*gladly*, and did many things," and yet John's labour was ultimately lost upon him. We are to sow the seed. It will be a savor of life unto life to some, and of death unto death to others; and who is sufficient for these things? At any apparent success that may attend our labours in trying to do good, we have all therefore occasion to "rejoice with trembling." Most earnestly do we pray that those precious souls who gave such candid and earnest attention to the word spoken at Milville, may not have heard in vain, but have reason to rejoice in the day of the Lord that they were called by the truth of God to contemplate both their Maker and themselves in a light they had never before seen.

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY, or *the Constitution of Man in relation to Immortality and Eternal Life*," is the title of a series of articles that Brother Walsh will

furnish for the Examiner. We regret that the first number of the series came too late for our present number. If Brother Walsh is as interesting in the succeeding numbers as in the one on hand, we can promise our readers that they will get the worth of their year's subscription to the Examiner, in those articles alone. Do try, friends, to scatter our paper more widely, that others may be benefitted as well as yourselves. All new subscribers will have the Examiner sent them from the commencement of the present volume. We cannot consent to take subscribers on any other terms, at present, as we have printed a regular number each month, and do not wish to break a volume; especially, when the whole volume is but *fifty cents*.

AN ANTI-DESTRUCTIONIST.—We have received from a friend a copy of a truly remarkable document, from the pen of Abraham C. Raysor, which, we are informed, was published in "The Church Advocate," under the caption, "A correspondence between a *Storrite* and a believer in *Bible Truth*."

We beg leave to decline publishing it. How much edification our readers will lose by this determination, may be imagined by a specimen we will give of Mr. Raysor's belief and advocacy of "Bible Truth."

BIBLE TRUTH.

"When all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be *destroyed forever*." Ps 92: 7.

"Thou castedst them down into *destruction*." Ps. 73: 17.

"Broad is the way that leadeth to *destruction*." Matt. 7: 13.

"If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God *destroy*." 1 Cor. 3: 17.

"Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," &c. 2 Thess. 1: 9.

"Whose *end* is *destruction*." Phill. 3: 19. "All the wicked will He (God) *destroy*." Ps. 145: 20. Rev. 11: 18.

"What if God willing to shew his wrath," &c., "endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to *destruction*." Rom. 9: 22.

"Fear him who is able to *destroy* both soul and body in hell." Matt. 10: 28.

"Whoso despiseth the word shall be *destroyed*." Prov. 13: 13.

ABRAHAM C. RAYSOR.

"I tell you plainly that there are many things among the Advent believers that I do not believe in, and among others is that doctrine of soul and body resting in the grave, and soul-destroying and diabolical doctrine of *destructionism*, which I firmly believe had its origin in the infernal pit of hell."

"I tell you plainly, that at the coming of Christ, I would as soon be found a believer in the religion of Mahomet, or a worshipper of the idol Juggernaut, as to be found a believer in that soul-destroying, abominable doctrine of *destructionism*."

Mr. Raysor's opposition to "*Storrites*" is of little consequence; but his antagonism to that word which abideth forever, as exhibited above, demands his more serious consideration. We pray the merciful Lord to forgive the blasphemous effusions of his intemperate and erroneous zeal. H. G.

"REVOLUTION IN FRANCE."—Our article under that head was written immediately after the reception of the news of that event, but not in time for the last Examiner. The events in Europe since that time, made known by later arrivals, serve to strengthen our convictions that we have taken the true view of that subject; but, after all, time must determine: we dare not speak with too much positiveness: modesty becomes us all in speaking on unfulfilled prophecy, or prophecy that is not fully developed.

"THE BEAST AND IMAGE BEAST."—Br. Alling's "Exposition of the 13th Chapter of Revelation," has been received and read. We are obliged to him for the copy sent us. It is as good as most we have seen on the subject; but, we have never yet seen anything on the two horned beast and its image that has perfectly satisfied us; and confess that we are still learners on that topic. Br. Alling's view is, that "*The Holy Alliance*" constitutes the two horned beast, with England for one horn and Russia for the other. The *number* of the beast, 666, is not so easily disposed of. "Let him that hath wisdom" do it. We must confess that we strongly incline to the "*Latin Kingdom*," as giving anything of a tolerable solution of this point.

"DASH THEM IN PIECES."—PSA. 2: 9.

Who are to be dashed in pieces? Why, say those who believe the world is to be burned and every body but the saints burned up with it at the time of the second advent, "all the heathen are to be dashed to pieces, so that none of them will be left."

We reply, *first*.—Zechariah positively declares there will be "LEFT *of the nations*" after the advent; and that too of men in the flesh. See Zech. 14: 16, to the end. The above construction, then, put upon the second Psalm, cannot be true. If the dashing of *the heathen* to pieces is what is spoken of, and breaking them with a rod of iron, then it must import the *subjection* under which they shall be brought to Christ and his government, *as nations;* which government it will be as impossible for them successfully to resist as for a potter's vessel to resist and withstand the blows of a rod of iron; so that it shall be true, as saith the prophet Isaiah, chap. 60: 12; "The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea those nations shall be utterly wasted."

But we are inclined to the opinion that the Psalmist is not speaking at all of *the people* of the nations, in the second Psalm, when he speaks of being broken with a rod of iron and dashed to pieces; but that he had special reference to the "*kings, rulers and judges* of the earth." They indeed hate to surrender their usurped authority to Christ "the KING of kings." But "the decree" has gone forth, and in due time will be executed, and God will "set" or "*anoint* his king upon his holy hill of Zion," on "David's throne;" and Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of David, will then "be the glory of thy people Israel," also, "a light to enlighten the Gentiles," who shall then especially be given to him for an "inheritance" with the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; for "ALL NATIONS SHALL SERVE HIM;" Psa. 72: 11; and "HE shall rebuke strong nations afar off, and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares," &c. Micah 4: 3.

Against this subjection to Israel's king, on the throne of his father David, "The *kings* of the earth set themselves, and the *rulers* take counsel together, against the LORD, and against his ANOINTED;" and the result of their consultation is, that they will not submit to this new government. But, "the Lord shall have them in derision" for their pride and folly. "Then shall he speak unto them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure:" His decree shall stand.—His Son shall have the kingdom under the whole heaven; and he shall "break them [viz. the opposing kings, rulers, and judges] with a rod of iron; he shall dash them to pieces like a potter's vessel."

That this is the true meaning of the Psalmist is evident from what immediately follows, viz: "Be wise *now, therefore*, O ye *kings*, be instructed, ye *judges* of the earth; serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling: kiss the Son, [submit to him] lest he be angry and ye perish," &c. Thus it appears, it is the kings, rulers and judges, of the earth who conspire against the purpose of God that his Son shall be King, and that all nations shall serve him, who are to be broken with the rod of iron and dashed in pieces, if they do not heed the counsel to submit themselves to the government of the king on David's throne. We look upon the 7th and 8th verses of the second Psalm as a parenthesis which includes *the decree* that aroused the kings and rulers of the earth to resistance; but, they are informed that their rage is vain, and that unless they peaceably submit to the Son of David, the king on the holy hill of Zion will destroy them. This being the case, there is nothing in this Psalm to countenance *the notion* that all men, except the saints, are to be cut off from the earth at the time of the second advent; and that notion is a most palpable contradiction of many of the most explicit and plain prophecies in the Bible.

THE REVOLUTION IN FRANCE.

We approach this subject with views and feelings different from many of our cotemporaries. We look at it in the light of prophecy, and believe it may be the commencement of the fulfilment of several. Two in particular will engage our attention at this time. The first is Daniel 2: 31—45. The second is Rev. 16th. In Dan. 2d, we have described what may be called four *universal* monarchies, or kingdoms—the head of *gold;* which is Babylon: the breast and arms of silver; or the Medo-Persian kingdom: the belly and sides of brass; or Grecian kingdom: the legs of iron, or the Roman kingdom: then, the feet and toes; or the Roman kingdom in its divided state, which divisions occurred in the fifth and sixth centuries, and have since that time increased to a multitude of lesser divisions *In* this divided state of the fourth, or Roman Kingdom; when there are many divisions into kingdoms, and when though "they mingle with the seed of men," by the various Sovereigns inter-marrying with each other's families, but cannot for all that "cleave one to another;" then, *in those days* "shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," or the fifth universal Monarchy, which is to "fill the earth and stand forever." To prepare the way for this last Monarchy, or Kingdom, "a stone rent from a mountain [so the Septuagint reads] without hands" is to *smite* the feet and toes of the image, "which were of iron and potter's clay, and *at last* break them to pieces." The *smiting* process is first, but "at last" [Septuagint] the *breaking* takes place; and after those monarchies are destroyed, the kingdom and empire of God will be fully developed and fill the whole earth. The *stone*, we think, represents *principles* which were to act upon the thrones of despots by a continuous smiting, till under the power thereof the whole system of despotic governments, whether civil or ecclesiastical, shall be broken to pieces and be carried away like the dust of the summer's threshing floor: then those principles are to have a final embodiment in the establishment of the Kingdom of God, that is to succeed the present monarchies of the eastern world. The stone was rent from a mountain without hands; indicating that it was a work dependant more upon God, than any agency he might employ. It was rent from the mountain not in the time of either of the *universal* monarchies, but in the divided state of the fourth: it was at that point in the prophecy the stone was seen rent from its lofty height. We are compelled to the conclusion, from present light, that the stone represents the *principles* of man's individual responsibility to God—his right to think, and to speak the convictions of his own mind untrammeled by civil or ecclesiastical despots. A long night of darkness had hung over the world on this subject: so deep was it that in the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries it was *death* to read the Scriptures in the language of the people. The great *principle* of man's right to read, think, and speak, responsible to God alone, was "rent" out by Martin Luther and the Reformers, as God's instruments to smite the image upon what was at that time, and still is, its feet. Those principles are a living, active, unyielding, and mighty engine, in the providence of God, to smite every species of despotism, till "at last" the image shall be destroyed and no place found for it. Those *principles* after struggling long in Europe for a resting place, took refuge in America, and here had a *partial embodiment* in the "Declaration of Independence;" a noble instrument; and though disgraced

and belied by the *practice* of this nation, yet it has stood as a continual rebuke to tyrants here and elsewhere. It has acted with such power on the European Despotisms as to shake every throne in the old Roman Empire; all of which are as certainly to crumble to dust by this operation as that prophecy cannot fail. All men see that those monarchies are falling: but few see that prophecy foretold that it should be so; nor do they see what is to follow their fall: they think it is to be Republicanism; but prophecy will develope another destiny for Europe and the world.

We now turn to Rev. 16th. There we find at the pouring out of the seventh vial, of the seven last plagues, which fill up the wrath of God, on the fourth, or divided kingdom, that there is "a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon earth, so mighty an earthquake and so great." Earthquake, in symbolical prophecy, denotes *Revolution.* As this revolution is to exceed all that has gone before it, we think we may safely conclude that it is the same as that denoted in Dan. 2d, by the breaking of the image, or the entire and final overthrow of European monarchies, and the shaking of all civil and ecclesiastical despotism to pieces. The present French Revolution *may be* the first shock of that "great earthquake," under the seventh and last vial. We do not affirm that it is, we wait for further developments before we decide.

The question will here arise—Why should the present revolution be considered the commencement of the "great earthquake" more than the revolution of 1789 or 1830, seeing the transactions of the former far exceeded in their calamities those of 1848? To this we answer: The French Revolution of 1789, was indeed *an* earthquake, but it was not, and, in the order of prophecy, could not be the great one spoken of as taking place under the seventh vial; because, at that time, the sixth vial, which was to "dry up the great river Euphrates"—the Ottoman or Mohammedan power, was not then poured out, nor did it begin to be till the Greek revolution, or about 1821. The French revolution of 1830, was still too early, as the effects of the sixth vial were not then so far developed as to make it certain what were to be its effects on Mohammedanism; but that is now settled: the Ottoman power is broken, never to recover. Under the sixth vial was also to come up a spirit of jealousy and rivalry among "the kings of the earth," or old Roman Empire: see Rev. 16: 13, 14. Under the sixth vial there was likewise to be a note of warning—"Behold I come as a thief," &c., which note of warning, it is evident, from what follows in the prophecy, would be generally disregarded: that note of warning has been given, in Europe first, and then in America. In the mean time great preparations have been making for war, either offensive or defensive; and the nations are all ready for the conflict; each dreading it, and yet all fearing it, particularly in Europe. We must then be very near the pouring out of the *Seventh Vial* if it has not actually commenced. Whether the present French revolution is the first shock of that great earthquake to be under this vial, or whether like the two previous ones only the fore-runners of the final shock, a few months will enable us to determine.

As to the *results* of the Revolution to take place in Europe, when all the monarchies there are to be broken to pieces, we are of opinion, that whatever efforts may be made to mould new governments, after the model of the United States, they will prove abortions; and that the whole continent of Europe will be in such a state of anarchy as will make all the people desire a deliverer from some quarter; but none who disregard prophecy can tell from what quarter deliverance will come. Here we call attention to the prophecy of Haggai, chap. 2: 21, 22: "*I will shake the heavens and the earth; And I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathens: and I will overthrow the chariots, and those that ride in them; and the horses and their riders shall come down, every one by the sword of his brother.*" Now see verses 6 and 7: "For thus saith the Lord of hosts, Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land. And I will shake all nations, and THE DESIRE OF ALL NATIONS SHALL COME."

Here the state, both *ecclesiastically* and *civilly*, of the nations is described: shaken to pieces—not knowing what to do with themselves—desiring a deliverer—but, ignorant where he is to come from, and yet he appears. Paul, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, applies this prophecy to the time of the establishment of the immovable kingdom of God; Heb. 12: 26—28; or, in other words—to the second advent of Christ, when the kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdom of our God and his Christ, whose "reign" is to be "forever and ever."

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

In the last Examiner we gave an article from the Sunday Dispatch, relating to the Rothschilds having purchased Palestine, or its being under mortgage to them. As the Rothschilds are Jews, and as they had, and are likely to have, much to do with the events that close up the present age, we have thought our readers might be as much interested with the following account of this remarkable house as we have been.

"In the year 1740, in a little Jewish settlement in 'Frankfort on-the-Maine,' dwelt a family of poor but respectable Jew Pedlars, and in that year they were blessed with a son whom they called Mayer Anselm Rothschild. They gave him what education their small means would permit, but, dying when he was at the age of eleven, left him to his own resources. He then earned a scanty living by writing, which he soon abandoned for a trade. But his ambition was to be a priest of his religion. *Fortunately for tottering dynasties of the present day, this was not accomplished.* His trade required him to travel; and after some years he returned to his native place and established a small business. He soon, however, gained considerable notoriety as a collector of old and curious coins, which brought him much in contact with persons of rank, among whom it was fashionable to make such collections; and finally he went to Hanover, as a clerk in a large house. Subsequently, with a few years' savings, he returned to Frankfort, married, and commenced a little exchange business. His great sagacity, strict punctuality and rectitude of conduct, pushed him rapidly forward, and towards the close of the century the Frankfort banking house had become famous and the profits large. The banker in the meantime had brought up ten children, of whom five sons were 'after his own heart;' and when he died left them vast wealth and extensive

business, with the injunction to dwell in strict and unbroken unity. And the injunction then bestowed has been faithfully carried out. The five sons conducted as many banking houses at the leading capitals of Europe. They were as follows: The eldest, Anselm, was born in 1773, and was the most substantial citizen of Frankfort, and, representing the father, was the head of the whole operations of the house. The second, Solomon, born in 1774, became a citizen of Vienna, where he is held in high estimation as a man, as well as a member of the most stupendous banking house in the world. The fourth son, Charles, was born in 1788, and has, since 1821, conducted the house at Naples, where his popularity is equal to any of his brothers. The youngest son, Jacob, was born in 1792, and is the banker for Paris, where he maintains a splendor that eclipses most of the princes of Europe. The third son we have yet to mention. Nathan, who was born in 1777, and became the head of the London house in 1798, and was in every intellectual respect a giant. It was observed of him that should he share in the chase it could only be to hunt elephants.

These five houses, combining all the financial resources of Europe in their movements, which are always simultaneous, have exercised for fifty years a power unseen, but overwhelming. Nearly all the government debts of Europe are of their contracting. Through the wars of Bonaparte their information was always correct, and always in advance of the British government, which was often a dependent upon them for information, as well as for means of action. Although their residences were always widely separated, each controlling all means of information, no important transaction was entered into without consultation and strict harmony of opinion among them all. Commercial exchanges and all movements of business were often known to and controlled by the old Jew in Frankfort, who could in the exercise of his great power, look with contempt upon feeble despots crying to him for help; and the aid asked depended on the assent of the five brothers Accordingly they were courted in every possible way. In 1813 they were made private commercial counsellors to the Hessian government; also the Austrian Emperor, who conferred on them the rank of *Barons*. In 1836 Nathan died, leaving £63,000,000, and seven children, of whom four were sons. The eldest, Lionel, who had been made Knight of Isabella by the Catholics at Madrid, and who is a Baron of Austria, in right of his father, appeared in 1836, on the London Change in the place his father had occupied for thirty-eight years.

Such is a brief history of this remarable family. But we have not yet done with our remarks upon the Rothschilds. Lionel, the last mentioned in the foregoing account, was recently elected a member of Parliament; and a change in the British Constitution was necessary to admit a Jew to Legislative honours and privileges: the amendment was made. What next? Recently, the English were compelled to yield the legal restrictions on the issue of the Bank of England, because the Baron Rothschild threatened to withdraw his deposites unless the Ministry changed the law; and again the Saxon was compelled to yield to the Jew. Then what? Why—the Jewish civil disabilities must be removed in England, that they may arise there to all the rights and privileges of other men; and it is done. They are no longer to be "trodden under foot" in England.

The prosperity of the Rothschilds in the present employment of their immense wealth, depends upon the stability of the thrones of Europe: and a a short time before the fall of Louis Philippe, the House of Rothchilds loaned the King of the French the money supposed to be sufficient to keep him on his throne; but that throne has fallen, and the other thrones of Europe tremble ready to fall. The Rothchilds cannot fail of seeing that those governments will be but poor security for the immense loans they have made them. Will that House look on and see these Monarchies sink, and allow their riches to be lost by the crumbling dynasties, and make no move to put their wealth in a place of safety? We cannot believe it. But, where shall they invest their immense substance? Their eyes must be turned to Palestine; and the re-establishing of a Government of their own; and the gathering of their own people, the Jews, must, in the natural course of things, become a favorite project with the Rothschilds. Their wealth and political power fully prepares them for such an undertaking. That movement, of itself, would hasten the downfall of European thrones, from the fact that the withdrawal of their funds from those governments would produce a financial crisis that must overthrow the Monarchies of Europe.

Since the above was written, we have clipt the following items from different papers relating to the Rothschilds.

"There is no MONEY to form a coalition against France, and the Jews will lend none—nay more, the Jews have none to lend; for who can tell where the Messrs. Rothschilds are going, if they continue to identify their fortunes with the success of royalty? * * * * * Without a Jew, Metternich and Nesselrode are but rusty wheels in a worn out machinery. In vain are the promises of Emperors and Kings, if not endorsed by a Jew, and hundreds of thousands of bayonets cannot raise a dollar."—*Wash. Cor. Ledger.*

"Three months since, the house of Rothschilds took the French loan, of about ten millions sterling at 75f., 25c; 47f. was the price at Paris on the 8th of March."—*Liverpool Cor. N. Y. Herald.*

"Baron Rothchilds was notified yesterday to leave Paris, which he declined to do; but he immediately sent the new government twenty-five million francs, which will, perhaps, cause the order to be modified or withdrawn."—*Paris Cor. N. Y. Herald, "Feb. 26."*

"Baron Rothchild was not ordered, but advised by the timid, to leave the city; but he did not enter into their fears, and has made himself useful since to the government and people."—*Ibid, Paris, Feb. 28.*

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

The Extracts of Letters in our March number pleased some of our friends, in Philadelphia, so well, that they have specially requested us to give them more. To gratify such, we have prepared another selection for this number, larger than before.

A HARD CASE: Br. C. Morley writes:—"I was somewhat amused the other morning at the manner in which the head of the family where I board—a member of the Dutch Reformed Church—read the 37th Psalm at family worship. He read to the 20th verse, to the clause—"The enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of Lambs," and there he stopped in the middle of the verse. Of course, he considered the remaining part of the verse—"they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away," rank heresy, dangerous for his family to hear read! What a heretic David must have been! And what a heretical book the Bible must be, as it does not conform to that superior authority—the man-made creeds! What is the remedy? For "great" are the creeds of the sects! Why, either all the bibles in Christendom must be expurgated or burned, or the *creed-idols* must fall, if time rolls on a few years in the present dispensation."

It was said, some years ago, in our native town, that a Universalist there had actually erased from his bible, all the threatenings against the wicked; so that, when any one quoted those threatenings his answer was—"That is not in *my Bible*." The opponents of the doctrine—"The dead praise not the Lord," and "all the wicked will God destroy,"—"they shall be as though they had not been," may as well begin to follow in the footsteps of the aforesaid Universalist; for they will find it just as difficult, from *God's Bible*, to maintain the endless misery doctrine, as he did to prove Universalism, till he manufactured that book into *my* Bible. Creeds of men may prove the soul's natural immortality—God's Book never can: they might just as well try to make it read, "God so hated the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever did not believe in him should have everlasting life:" and add—"It is written"—"Ye shall not surely die."

—

DR. A. DOOLITTLE, New York, writes:—

When you sent me the first lecture on the destruction of the wicked, from Albany, [1842,] I read but a little of it. I was grieved to think you had run into so great an error. I laid it down, and did not take it up again until you sent me the second lecture, I looked at it, and behold these words, in large letters, stared me full in the face: "ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?" I thought, what does this mean? I had never heard the question before. I read it through, and then hunted up the first, and read that through. I was surprised. Let me tell you, if it had not been for these large capitals arresting my attention, I do not know when I should have seen the truth; and many more have been arrested by the same. Can you not place them on your paper where they may be seen? They will do good; they strike one's mind with great force. I praise the Lord that you was made an instrument in his hand, of leading my mind to embrace this truth; to Him be all the glory, Amen. It was a good while before I could believe that when a man dies, if he was a Christian, but what he was alive for evermore. But, I soon found, that man had no life but in Christ; for He is the resurrection and the life—that the dead know not anything—in the very day he dies his thoughts perish; but, praise the Lord, when he who is our life shall appear, we shall appear with him in glory; and not before. The pernicious doctrine, that when a Christian dies he goes to heaven and receives his reward, is doing great damage to souls. "Get ready for death!" Why, death, as a consideration for repentance to sinners, is not to be found in the Bible. We have great cause to be thankful that the Lord has caused us to see the truth.

I think the coming of the Lord is very near. I will refer to Luke, 21st chapter. "On the earth distress of nations, with perplexity, the seas and waves roring;" or, as some say, "the seas and inland waters agitated, 'and men's hearts failing them for fear, and looking after those things that are coming on the earth, for,' or because, 'the powers of the heavens should be shaken.'" Now, is it not the shaking of the power of the heavens that produces the effects on men here spoken of? And if I am correct, is not the coming of the Son of man the next event? And may we not look for it daily? I want to understand the truth, for nothing else can do us good; may the Lord guide us into the truth, and prepare us for the great event, Amen.

In accordance with Brother Doolittle's suggestion, we have inserted the question "ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?" at the head of our editorial department, with the Bible answer, there to remain, for opposers to reply to or scoff at, as is most agreeable to them.

—

BR. THOS. P. HEDRICK, Laurel, Indiana, writes:—

If God has called us to the work of proclaiming the second advent of His Son, he has also put it into our hearts to exhibit the state of the dead and the end of the wicked, which important doctrines show the necessity of his coming, for man is dependant on the second coming of Christ and the resurrection for all future existence after death; and if there be no resurrection of the dead, then they that have fallen *asleep* in *Christ* are perished. I am glad you have associated with you, in the editorial of the Examiner, *Brother Walsh*, as it will enable you to publish more largely, and present a variety of matter upon those valuable subjects. "*Dig deep*," brethren, for the truth; it is the truth alone which sanctifies us, and glorifies our heavenly Father. The Examiner is just what the reading community want; and how thankful we ought to feel that we have been conducted after God's way into this glorious light; *God* is light, and in him is no darkness at all; and while I can approach this light, and enjoy such sweet intercourse with its divine source, I fear not the charge of *Infidelity*, neither do I regard it; but as I have freely received of the Lord, I will endeavour to do something to roll on the glad tidings of the coming of our Redeemer, and the destruction of all his enemies, and the restitution of those things spoken of by the Holy Prophets.

Will you, in some future number of the Exami-

ner, take up this subject, the restitution spoken of by the Prophets, and show us what you consider is to be restored—cite us to the prophecies which speak of it, and go into it fully? It is a subject very much needed at this time, in order to correct the mistakes into which the churches have all fallen.

—

BR. R. E. LADD, Cabotville, Mass , writes :—

BROTHER STORRS: I am greatly edified by the Examiner. My heart sympathizes with its general character better than with any other paper extant. May God bless you in your efforts to spread Scriptural Truth. I rejoice that you are so much encouraged; and that a better feeling is prevailing among Christians towards the Truth of God. We are still holding on our way, and occasionally having additions to our ranks. Several have been converted to God and to the *whole* truth (or to a readiness to receive it,) within a short time past.

Accompanying the above, Brother Ladd sent us *eleven* new subscribers; which, with the twenty he became responsible for previously, makes thirty-one he has furnished us since the commencement of the present volume. Who will go and do likewise? Several others have done nobly also; for which they have our thanks.

—

BR. DANIEL BEACH, Charlton, N. Y., writes :—

BROTHER STORRS: I feel very thankful to you for the Examiner. I always read it with a great interest. When it comes I do not know how to lay it down until I have read it through. When I first got hold of the "Six Sermons," I was strongly prejudiced against your views; and my wife was so afraid that I should be led astray, she hid them for some time; but before I had got through reading them, my prejudice was all gone; and now my wife and myself are both as firm believers in the doctrine of the destruction of the wicked as any part of the Bible; and also the unconscious state of the dead. How many passages in the Bible teach us that the dead know not any thing; but, O, that tradition in which we have been trained; how much it has done to keep us in the dark, and blind our minds from the truth of the Bible.

—

BR. EZRA CROWELL. Bowdoinham, Me., writes :—

BROTHER STORRS: The Examiner is received. Its just the thing we need at this time. It is indeed to me like cold water to a thirsty soul. It is solid meat upon which one can feed for weeks. I rejoice that the time has come that you can publish regularly. This is what I have long desired. I have no doubt you will soon be able to present us with an enlarged semi-monthly. Your paper needs only to be known, to be appreciated by the lovers of Bible truth. This cause has suffered some in this region for the want of able advocates; but, I rejoice that so many able pens and voices are being raised up to promulgate and defend the *truth*.

—

BR. BENJAMIN TILLEY, Bristol, R. I., writes :—

BR. STORRS:—I have received your paper, and have been highly gratified in perusing the contents. I find those subjects discussed in an able manner that I consider of vital importance, and they have long occupied much of my study and reflection; and I have been for some time trying, according to my best ability, to defend them; and I think we have arrived at a point when we can see clearly the force of our Saviour's admonition, "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life."

—

BR. SAML. BROWN, Milwaukie, Wis., writes :—

BR. STORRS:—It is with pleasure that I receive monthly the Examiner. Whilst I have the satisfaction of reading it, I wish to aid in publishing it. There are a few of us here, that are not tied to any sect nor paper; but, we love our Bibles and love to receive light from any and all that can give it, without being prejudiced against any. You will excuse me for not writing in terms of praise of you or your paper, for I have seen so much of such writing that it disgusts me. I think the best way a brother can show his approbation of a paper is to send the money to sustain it. We are trying to live, with our lamps trimmed and burning, looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

—

BR HENRY SMITH, Addison, Vt., writes :—

BR. STORRS:—Ever since I became a subscriber for the Bible Examiner, I have received it regularly every month; have read and examined it candidly and prayerfully, I hope, and it has been the means of inducing me to read and search the scriptures more than I have ever done before, in the same length of time, and I must say, as an honest man, that I am strongly inclined to believe the doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead, and the final destruction of the wicked, (at the second death,) to be a Bible doctrine; and the interest I have heretofore had in reading the Examiner and comparing it with the bible, has by no means abated.

—

BR. TRUMAN GRANDY, Vergennes, Vt., writes :—

BR. STORRS:—I have received the three first Nos. of the present volume of the Bible Examiner, for which I feel grateful. I have read those through with much interest.

How glorious does the doctrine of the resurrection appear, when we can see that "they who have fallen asleep in Christ are perished" without it? Which doctrine cannot be true; and Paul was greatly in error; and they who have fallen asleep in Christ are "not perished," if indeed (as orthodox theology (?) teaches us,) they have gone home to Heaven and happiness at death, or, when they fall asleep. O! how we have been spoiled, through "philosophy and vain deceit." How long received for "doctrines" the "commandments of men" Yours, in hope of Eternal Life.

—

BR. R. L. PARTRIDGE, Maysville, Ohio, writes :—

BR. STORRS:—I am heartily thankful for the Examiner, and think that I have gained much light from it. To give you a little of my experience I will say—that I was awaked up to the subject of the sleep of the deed by the word let fall in a sermon, which was some four years ago; and since that time, I have been examining the Bible on that subject and others, and became convinced that the dead must sleep; but I did not discover the relationship existing between that doctrine, and that of life and death, yet I had discovered that orthodox preachers treated the subject in such a commingled light, that it amounted to utter confu-

sion. Oh the depths of the prejudice of education. I did not know half its strength. The orthodox cry here is "Infidelity," &c. Some speak not knowing any better, others not wishing to know better. But there are some that will read and listen. Oh that men would let their common understandings bear on this matter, and not listen so much to the clergy; for it is so plain that "he that runs may read," if the mind is not previously cramped by a theory.

The cause here looks brighter every day. Many are willing to listen to arguments and the simple truths of the Book. We have preaching on the subject of the Kingdom once in two weeks, and a prayer meeting weekly. The preaching is by Bro. Lyons, who labours here and through the adjacent country; and we can say, as one Bro. in the last Examiner said, if we have not changed the profession of some, "we have changed their prayers."

—

Brs. Z. Smith and Wm. Moss, Elberton, Ga., write:

Br. Storrs:—Continue to us the Bible Examiner. We do not wish them stopped, as we like them well, and think the doctrine they contain the best we ever read. We think the Examiner is opening the eyes of some here, and we expect to get you more subscribers shortly.

—

Br. D. B. Eldred, Homer, Mich., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—I am glad to hear that ministers are coming to the truth on the state of the dead and end of the wicked. One in this State, Br. Manings Curry, has lately embraced the truth, and is now preaching Life and Death to the people.

—

Br. J. P. Pritchard, Mocksville, N. C., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—I am much pleased with your paper, and shall do all I can to obtain subscribers. The sermons you were pleased to give me last fall, when in the city, I have distributed wherever I thought they would be read and do good. I have some on hand yet, and shall hand them out whenever I see they will be read. I am pleased that you have associated with you Br. Walsh.

Had man not have sinned he would not have died, but would have inherited the earth forever; but, in consequence of sin producing death, the resurrection is, in one sense, a doctrine of necessity; for, without it the original design of God would have been frustrated—men would have died—and the earth would have to be peopled by another creation. But, in the resurrection we see both the wisdom and power of Jehovah; it is a glorious truth, and to the child of God that hope that supports him amid all the ills that fall to our lot in this world. Were it not for that, truly, of all men they would be the most miserable.

My brother-in-law has been lately excluded from the Baptish church near this place, for his belief of the truth; and after his exclusion earnestly entreated to give up his views and return to the church, they believing him to be a Christian.

—

Dr I. F. Lee, Meltonsville, N. C., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—I received six copies of the six sermons, and three numbers of the Bible Examiner for the present year. Enclosed are five dollars, which you will place to my credit. Send me six copies more of the six sermons.

I am very busy, professionally, as they say in this country, and have little or no time to spare at this moment.

One preacher of the denomination to which I belong (Baptist,) has been excluded lately for his belief in the doctrine advanced in your sermons. I am well acquainted with him, and know him to be a man of piety and consistency—a Christian to all human appearance. But I will write to you again ere long, and, I trust, shall have something interesting to mention.

—

Br. A. N. Seymore, Plymouth, Mich., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—I have been engaged in proclaiming the glad tidings of the speedy coming of Christ for nearly four years past, and I feel weighed down under the solemn impression of the truth, that it is soon to be witnessed by an astonished world; and my soul cries out, what manner of persons ought we to be who profess to be looking for such momentous events, as the apperring of Christ, the renovation of the earth, the destruction of the wicked, &c. None but the pure in heart can see God in peace; none but those who are willing to sacrifice all for Christ, and his truth will be able to stand before him in peace, without spot and blameless in that day. God grant we may purify our hearts by obeying the truth, for we are sanctified and purified through the truth. There are truths advocated by you, and many of the Advent brethren that have not had their proper influence on my mind till within a few months past. The reason why they have not, are quite numerous, but, I fear, not very weighty. A short time since, my mind became settled relative to the sleep of the saints, and the destruction of the wicked; and while travelling from place to place, to preach the glad tidings of the kingdom nigh at hand, we have placed these truths out prominently before our hearers, and many have rejoiced in these righteous sentiments, as well as those concerning the coming of the Lord. After the darkness was past, and my mind became clear on these subjects, I wondered with astonishment, that I cherished the old theory as long as I did. It is utterly impossible for me to believe in the common theory, with the light I now have on this subject. "The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth, much more the sinner and the wicked." Their recompense is to be punished according to the deeds done in the body. "Burnt up root and branch"—"consumed soul and body," and "be as though they had not been." I can reconcile the Bible in this way and no other. My Bible is becoming more and more consistent, more and more beautiful and glorious, praise the Lord. We have just closed a series of meetings, in which some twelve or fifteen have taken a decided stand upon these questions, and many more have been favourably impressed, and have commenced searching the scriptures for a decision. I fear not the result of their investigation. The ministers do all they can to oppose, by crying "Wolf, wolf," "Infidelity," &c. But we take a decided stand, and give them the liberty of meeting us in private or public on those questions. As yet we have not the pleasure of accepting an invitation to discuss these important Bible doctrines. God's truth is mighty and will prevail. Amen.

Yours in hope of speedy immortality and *Eternal Life*.

Br. N. A. Hitchcock, Tyler, Ill., writes :—

Br. Storrs :—I obtained, not long since, a copy of the Bible Examiner, and perused its contents. I became satisfied that the truth, as therein presented, might accomplish much good. I know of several in this place, who have been rescued from Universalism : and had not the plain truth, respecting the state of the dead and the end of the wicked, been set before their minds, they doubtless would have remained still in their sins. You say, "you intend, by the grace of God, to be kept free from that bigotry which thinks no light can be elicited beyond that now enjoyed." I would be glad to always occupy that place myself. I would most ardently pray to be led into all truth. I never felt the necessity more than at the present time, of standing free, believing the true Church is composed of all true believers. There are about twenty in this place, most of whom I have evidence are serving God according to the light they have. We take the word and Spirit as our rule of action, and acknowledge no unscriptural *name* as appropriate to the household of faith.

—

Br. A. B. Magruder, Charlottesville, Va., writes :—

To the Editors of the Bible Examiner : — I read your paper with both pleasure and profit, and knew not until your association of Br. Walsh in the editorial department, that the "Examiner" was still published. Several years ago, it fell into my hands, and I derived no little light and instruction from your (Br. Storrs') "Six Sermons." The perusal of these, stimulated me to further inquiry, and resulted in my conviction of the truth of the doctrine of the ultimate destruction of the wicked, a point which, though for years previous a disciple of Christ, I had never thoroughly understood. Since then, being in the midst of infidels and opposers, both "orthodox" and aliens, I have deemed it due to the truth I held, to put forth some defence of its claims. This I did by the publication, last year, of a pamphlet entitled "*Truth tested by Scripture.*"

—

Br. John T. Richardson, Newburyport, Mass., writes :—

Br. Storrs :—I was informed by a friend last week, that you was publishing a periodical in pamphlet form. I wish you to send me a copy, with the back numbers. I have your "Six Sermons" on the end of the wicked, and the state of the dead.

There is a church of Advent believers in this place, well united and prosperous. Nearly all of them believe with you in the end of the wicked, and the intermediate state of the dead.

☞ The Editor of this paper preaches every Lord's day at Commissioners Hall, Third street, below Green, east side ; at 10, A. M., and in the evening at 7½ o'clock.

The "Six Sermons" on the End of the Wicked, &c., can be had at No. 21 North Sixth street, or of the Author, 18 Chester street, between Race and Vine, 8th and 9th. Price, in Pamphlet 15 cents, or ten copies for $1.00. The pamphlet includes the views of the author on the question, "Have the dead knowledge?" The Sermons advocate the doctrine, that "All the wicked will God *destroy*," or, cause them to cease from life, after the judgment.

"The Aspects of Phrenology on Revelation; or, *Materialism, Fatalism, Regeneration, Creeds, Atheism, The operation of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of men*, and Human Responsibility, *Philosophically considered, in a series of Lectures*, By J. T. Walsh." Such is the Title of an Octavo pamphlet of 74 page, published by Br. Walsh, Richmond, Va., 1846. For sale at 21 North Sixth street, Philadelphia, Pa. *Price 25 cents.*

CONSOLATIONS FOR THE LONELY.

BY MARY HOWITT.

There is a land where beauty cannot fade,
Nor sorrow dim the eye,
Where true love shall not droop, nor be dismayed,
And none shall ever die;
Where is that land, O where?
For I would hasten there;
Tell me—I fain would go,
For I am weary with a heavy woe!
The beautiful have left me all alone;
The true, the tender, from my path have gone!
O guide me with thy hand,
If thou dost know that land,
For I am burthened with oppressive care,
And I am weak and fearful with despair;—
Where is it? Tell me where.

Friend, thou must trust in him who trod before
The desolate paths of life;
Must bear in meekness, as he meekly bore,
Sorrow, and pain, and strife!
Think how the Son of God
These thorny paths hath trod;
Think how he longed to go,
Yet tarried out, for thee, the appointed wo.
Think of his weariness in places dim,
Where no man comforted or cared for him!
Think of the blood-like sweat,
With which his brow was wet;
Yet how he prayed unaided and alone,
In that great agony, "Thy will be done!"
Friend do not thou despair;
Christ, from his heaven of heavens, will hear thy prayer.

THE MAGNETIC TELEGRAPH.

BY JAMES GILBORNE LYONS, LL. D.

Along the smooth and slender wires,
The sleepless heralds run,
Fast as the clear and living rays
Go streaming from the sun:
No peals or flashes heard or seen,
Their wondrous flight betray,
And yet their words are plainly felt,
In cities far away.

But faster still than tidings borne
On that electric cord,
Rise the pure thoughts of him who loves
The Christian's life and Lord—
Of him who, taught in smiles and tears,
With fervent lips to pray,
Maintains high converse here on earth
With bright worlds far away.

Ay! though nor outward wish is breathed,
Nor outward answer given,
The sighing of that humble heart
Is known and felt in heaven:
Those long frail wires may bend and break;
Those viewless heralds stray;
But Faith's least word shall reach the throne
Of God, though far away.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. **PHILADELPHIA, JUNE, 1848.** **No. 6.**

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 21 N. SIXTH STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY;

OR, THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN, IN RELATION TO IMMORTALITY AND ETERNAL LIFE.

No. I.

"What is man?" This question has been variously answered by skeptics, infidels, and theologians. One replies, he is an *Angel*—a *God*. Another, that he is a *demon*. Another, still, that he is the offspring of *chance*, and that his "death is an eternal sleep." And still another, that he is *immortal*, destined to live in God's presence in the enjoyment of inexpressible happiness, or to burn in hell through the endless succession of ages!

Thus, "the world by wisdom knew not God." "They became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools." The schools of India and Egypt were the prolific sources of "philosophy falsely so called;" and Pythagoras and Plato its great masters. They predicated immortality upon the *nature of man*, and argued that he was *constitutionally* in possession of an immaterial, incorruptible essence, which was a part of the Deity; and that its destiny was transmigration, and a final absorption into the "Soul of the Universe." When christianity was popularized, ascended the throne, and was clothed with secular power, this dogma of Paganism was amalgamated with pure christianity, and thus the latter was rendered more acceptable, in the adulterated form, to the stupid and licentious admirers of a "vain philosophy." Since that period, the same dogma has been handed down through the dark ages, being transmitted from sire to son—from priest to people—from school to school, until, like a mighty and deadly stream, its waters have poisoned the hearts and heads of all mankind: corrupted every science, and nullified and stultified the truth of God! This pagan tradition now constitutes the *soul*—the *life* and *spirit* of every sect in christendom. It is preached from every pulpit in the land, taught in every lecture room, inculcated in every school, and distilled into the youthful mind in every family!

Every science is tinged with it. The astronomer contemplates the unnumbered worlds, revolving in the immensity of space, as the abode of his departed spirit; and talks of "gaining *worlds* beyond the skies." He, vainly thinks, his departed ghost, on some errand of mercy or inquest of knowledge, will pass from world to world, and be lost in the contemplation of the grandeur, sublimity and beauty of Jehovah's works! The physiologist, while he examines the organization of the human machine, imagines that he is contemplating the "clay tenement of an immortal soul." The phrenologist, as he dissects the human brain, and unfolds its beautiful convolutions, in imagination beholds within its anfractuosities evidences of the deathless nature of that "divine essence"—that life imparting and thought-producing spirit that once animated it!

And thus it is, that every Medical School and Theological Seminary, and College of Literature, is made a fountain of corruption, deep and wide, to the human mind. And, not only so, but even the political prints, as they chronicle the demise of some political leader or military chieftain, speak of their exchanging the honors of civil and military life, for the rich honors and evergreen laurels of the paradise of God. For, in their wisdom, they eulogize to heaven the man whose hands have been washed a thousand times in the warm gushing blood, fresh from the heart of his fellow man!

And, not only this, but even the babe upon the knee of its mother, is taught to lisp the delusive doctrine of congenital immortality!

Seeing, then, that in every department of society, in all the streams of social life—in all the ramifications of religious and political systems, this desolating delusion is taught by pens and unnumbered tongues, are we not justifiable in making one effort to dispel the delusion, and to pour into the minds of our readers the light of *christian philosophy*? Should we not meet error on its own ground, and, if possible, drive it from the field? Certainly we should! Let us, then, draw the sword, throw the scabbard to the winds, and do battle for the truth. The *truth* has nothing to fear in any investigation. Truth seeks the light, while error shrouds itself in the gloom of pagan darkness!

This doctrine of "hereditary immortality," is not only proclaimed from the pulpit, and echoed by every press in the country; but it is, also, wafted on the breeze in the melody of song! And here we have a specimen of this *Pago-christianized theology*:

"Vital spark of heavenly flame,"
Quit, O quit this mortal frame!
Trembling, hoping, ling'ring, flying—
O the pain the bliss of dying!

"Hark, the whisper! angels say,"
'Sister spirit, come away;'
What is this absorbs me quite,
Steals my senses, shuts my sight,
Drowns my spirit, draws my breath?
"Tell me, my soul, can this be death!"

"The world recedes, it disappears;"
Heaven opens on my eyes; my ears
With sounds seraphic ring;
Lend, lend your wings—I mount, I fly;
O grave where is thy victory?
"O death where is thy sting!"

Here we have the theology of Plato, in all its sublimity! In this *death scene* we have the "vital spark," or immortal soul, of "heavenly flame"—of the "divine essence," a part of the deity. Then follows an injunction (from the *body* of course!) for this "vital spark" to "quit this mortal frame." Then follow the attitudes of the "vital spark"—which is represented as "trembling, hoping, ling'ring, flying;" and exclaiming—"O the pain, the bliss of dying!" This may be good poetry, but it is miserable philosophy, and worse theology. For, if it have any meaning at all, the *body* is supposed to address the spirit thus: "Vital spark of heavenly flame, quit, O quit this mortal frame." To which the spirit replies: "I am trembling, hoping, ling'ring, flying." And then exclaims—*mind*—the *spirit* exclaims—"O the pain, the bliss of dying." According to this, therefore, the *spirit trembles, lingers, hopes, flies*, and, finally *dies!* For, it is represented as saying—"O the *pain*, the *bliss* of *dying!*" This, we repeat, is bad philosophy and worse theology; but, then, we suppose we must excuse its advocates, as it was merely a freak of the Poet's imagination.

But, to return, the spirit is then represented as addressing the *body* thus: "*Hark!*" did you not hear "the whisper!" "Angels say—sister spirit, come away." The poor body, then, already crumbling to dust, is made to say: "What is this absorbs me quite, steals my senses, shuts my sight, *drowns my spirit!*" (sad catastrophe!) "draws my breath?" "Tell me, *my soul*, can this be *death?*" The spirit "drowned," and the body in "death!" *Both dead!!* Platonists, teach your poets better, or they will make sad havoc of your theology!

But now comes the crisis—the eventful period; when the soul takes its flight, and "gains kingdoms beyond the skies." The spirit therefore exclaims: "The world recedes, it disappears;" and "heaven opens on my eyes;" and "my ears with sounds seraphic ring." An appeal is then made to the attending angels—"Lend, lend your wings," with the annunciation, "I mount, I fly." And as the departed ghost leaves the world, and passes through the trackless ether, it looks back to the grave, where it's "mortal coil" is deposited, and shouts—"O grave where is thy victory? O death where is thy sting?"

Such is the scene before us! And such is a specimen of modern Platonism!!

But when we turn our attention to the word of God—to the testimony of prophets and apostles, we see no such teaching there. That sacred volume points not to the day of one's death, as the time when the song of victory will be sung, but to the period when the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and enter into the Kingdom of God. The apostle Paul fixes the time, when he says—"Christ the first fruits, *afterwards they that are Christ's* AT HIS COMING." "THEN," but not before, "*shall be brought to pass the saying*—DEATH IS SWALLOWED UP IN VICTORY—*O death where it thy sting? O grave where is thy victory?*"

Having made these INTRODUCTORY REMARKS, we shall now proceed to the discussion of our subject. We shall invite the reader's attention, first, to the

LAWS OF HEREDITARY DESCENT.

We solicit attention to *this point*, because it is contended that "immortality" is "*hereditary*," or congenital. And, if so, the advocates of this hypothesis can certainly point out the *law* by which such a transmission is effected. If they cannot do this, let them acknowledge it, and abandon the hypothesis as untenable.

Let not the *modest* world suppose that we are going to disclose any thing calculated to shock the nerves of the most sensitive, or tinge the cheek of the most exquisitely fastidious. We only intend to speak of things—of *laws*, which God has made; and of which the Holy Spirit has spoken. Let none presume to teach JEHOVAH *modesty*, or the HOLY SPIRIT *refinement!*

It is now an established truth, and admitted by all Physiologists, that *physical*, *moral*, and *intellectual* qualities are transmissible. If this were denied, we could present an overwhelming amount of evidence in proof of its truth. But presuming that no man will risk his reputation for learning by calling it in question, we shall proceed to argue from it as an axiomatic truth.

Now the question arises, Why are physical, moral, and mental qualities transmissible? The answer is, that it is a law of generation that like shall produce its like. This law obtains through all animated nature. It is recognized by the Bible; for God commanded the first human pair "to be fruitful, multiply, and replenish the earth." And in accordance with the endowment of his nature, it is added, that he "begot a son in his own *image* and *likeness?*" There are certain *elements*, or *attributes*, entering into the constitution of man, which give *character to the race;* and these *elements* are common to all mankind. They are often, perhaps always, modified by external influences, as well as by internal passions and emotions; but still they exist in, and give character to all. It is upon this principle that all mankind resemble each other in form, features, &c. So we find no difficulty in accounting for *hereditary* traits of a *physical* character. In the estimation of some, perhaps there might be more doubt as to the *laws* by which *moral* and *mental* qualities are transmitted. But when we know that the *moral* and *mental* elements of human nature have their corresponding organs in the brain, all difficulty is at an end. The whole organization is transmitted; every part, every organ, whether purely animal, or whether of a moral or intellectual character, is congenital. Some times diseases are inherited; sometimes a fine elastic constitution, with splendid moral and intellectual faculties, is transmitted. And the reason is obvious, *for these* MORAL *and* MENTAL *powers depend, for their very existence, upon the material organization of the brain.* And the adult man possesses no constituent element, physical, moral, or mental, which is not possessed by the child in *embryo*. The powers of the full grown man are *in-born*, they are hereditary. Education serves to develop, to mature, and to modify the faculties of the mind; but it can *never create* a single one. Let this never be forgotten. The unborn infant, then, is the future man in every essential particular, except development. The *embryo* is the *miniature man*, physically, morally, and mentally, the modifying influences of education excepted.

Now, if man has an immortal soul, mind, or spirit, the *unborn infant*—the *embryo*—the *germ* of human life has, necessarily has, the same. For immortality is not a *thing* but an *attribute* of something. If, therefore, it be an attribute of the adult man, it must be an attribute of the same man when

in *embryo*. All the elements, as well as the attributes of man, exist in the original *embryonic germ*; and by vital magnetism they are evolved, developed, and matured. Consequently, if immortality be hereditary, we must look for its manifestation in the *germ of life*, as well as in the full grown man! Here, then, we have the astounding physiological hypothesis of the *transmission of immortality*, from sire to son; and from one generation to another! Thus, it is assumed, "the divine essence"—a "part of the Deity," is handed down, according to the laws of hereditary descent, to the last generation of man! In this case *abortions* do not alter the case, for they, too, possessed immortal souls! And, then, to cap this climax of absurdity and blasphemy the man of special election and reprobation, comes forward, and, in accordance with the theory of eternal *soul-burning*, declares, as one did in Virginia, that there are "infants in hell not a span long!" And, still further, as if to mock Jehovah, "who only hath immortality," the devotees of licentiousness, of deep and damnable prostitution, are engaged in the good work of producing *immortals*, and transmitting the "divine essence" of incorruptibility! And, just here, we must be allowed to say, that, in our estimation, this doctrine of hereditary immortality, which mocks, and nullifies, and stultifies the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, that "God only hath immortality;" and that "eternal life is the gift of God"—this doctrine, we say, is the rankest infidelity of any age! It lies at the foundation of every system of error, with which we are acquainted. It is the basis of "*purgatorial purification*," "invocation of saints," the "worship of martyrs," and a thousand other fooleries of Catholicism. And last, though not least, it constitutes the grand work of the doctrine of eternal soul-burning in the endless fires of hell! In a word, it is fraught with untold mischief, to the truth of the gospel.

But the doctrine is utterly untrue; we inherit disease, mortality, and death, but immortality and life are attributes of the kingdom of God. Men may inherit the most loathsome diseases, or they may be born idiots; but the boon of incorruptibility can never be transmitted by sinful flesh! "That which is born of the flesh, is *flesh*," and not *immortality*. And Paul says—"I know that in me, that is in *my flesh*, dwelleth no good thing." Immortality, if hereditary, dwells "in the flesh," and is certainly a "good thing;" Paul, therefore, had none of it. Job asks the question: "Why died I not from the womb? Why did I not expire at the time of my birth? Why did the knees receive me? or why the breasts that I should be nursed? For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have *slept: then had I* been at rest, *or as a hidden untimely birth I had not been, as infants which never saw light.*"

Again, he says: "Why then hast thou brought me forth from the womb? O that I had expired, and no eye had seen me! *I should have been as though I had not been;* I should have been carried from the womb to the grave."

How very different is this teaching from that of the moderns, who maintain that immortality is hereditary; and that their children, *idiots* though they be, are immortal! Immortal idiots!! From such theology may the world soon be delivered! But there is another class of *immortal-soulists*, who take a position somewhat different from the above. They yield the doctrine of hereditary immortality so far as to admit that there is no immortality in *embryonic life;* but that, when the infant emerges from its prison-house, and, for the first time, inhales the atmosphere, then it becomes possessed of an immortal spirit.

This position, though a modification of the former, is not less hypothetical; and, when examined in the light of philosophy and revelation, it will be found equally fallacious.

The atmosphere is composed, chemically speaking, of oxygen and nitrogen, neither of which possesses the attribute of immortality; but, even if they did, they are not possessed of *intelligence*, which is a radical idea associated with spirit. Besides oxygen and nitrogen, man breathes an aqueous vapour, electricity and light. He lives, moves, and has his being in an immense ocean of magnetism, which fills the universe; and in which all vegetables and animals live, and all world's revolve! The atmosphere contains the "spirit of the breath of life;" that "breath" which was "breathed into the nostrils of Adam," inflated his lungs, and made him "a living soul." The same "breath of life," which God "breathed into the nostrils of Adam," is breathed into the nostrils of every living thing. The unborn infant lives, but does not breath. The first inspiration of the new born babe, is the inflation of its nostrils and lungs by the "breath of life." But, as we observed before, there is no intelligent spirit in all this: it merely acts upon the wonderful organization of man, and the machinery of life and thought is put in motion. And when the man dies, he yields up his spirit—his breath—"the breath of life" to "God who gave it; and his organization moulders into dust, in verification of the sentence pronounced upon him: "*Dust thou art, and into dust shalt thou return.*"

Having, then, as we think, sifted the *foundation* of this subject, we shall follow it still further in its ramifications in our next article, in which we shall speak of the INSTRUMENT OF THOUGHT AND FEELING. And, in conclusion, we will put one question to all those who inquire, *by what* "LAW THE WICKED ARE TO BE DESTROYED." Our question is this: "*By what law" can immortality be transmitted from sinful flesh*, AND BY A PROCESS NECESSARILY CORRUPTIBLE, *to one's* OFFSPRING? J. T. W.

WITCHCRAFT, &c.

By HENRY JONES.

In the Feb. No. of the Bible Examiner I noticed an article on the subject of Witchcraft, which seems intended to show that the raising of Samuel the prophet from the dead, by the witch at Endor, was a mere trick of the woman, with so much craftiness of her own, that she made a perfect dupe of King Saul, without being aided by any invisible power to perform any thing supernatural on the occasion. I am aware that this is becoming a very common view of witchcraft in general, and among professed christians, and I have just been hearing it warmly supported in a public debate on the following question, viz: "Is MESMERISM IDENTICAL WITH WITCHCRAFT?" and particularly on one side the case of the witch of of Endor, was considered as only a *human* imposture, as in the article above mentioned. It is not my design, therefore, to review the arguments of the article, no, of others, of the same theory, though I

would present a few things as reasons for believing most sincerely, that the scripture account of "*Witchcraft*," "*Sorcery*," "*Magic*," "*Sooth-saying*," "*Necromancy*," "*Miracles*" of "*Spirits of devils*," &c., (all the same,) is to be understood as literally as it is given, and as telling us of the real mysterious works or "*miracles*" of Satan, (frequently combined with human agency,) instead of its telling us of the legerdemain, or deception, practiced by mere *human* sagacity and power.

Before proceeding any further, it may not be amiss to give a brief extract on this question from a very distinguished human author, intended as a rebuke upon the now very common theory, that there never has been any such thing as "*witchcraft*" in reality; or "*miracles*" of "*familiar spirits*." He says:

"The sixth species of offence against God, or religion, of which our ancient books are full, is a crime of which one knows not well what account to give. I mean the offence of witchcraft, conjurology, enchantments or sorcery. To deny the possibility, yea, actual existence of witchcraft and sorcery, is at once flatly to contradict the revealed word of God, both in the Old and New Testaments. And the thing itself is a truth to which every nation in the world hath, in its turn, borne testimony, either by examples seemingly well attested, or by prohibitory laws, which at least suppose the possibility of commerce with evil spirits."—*Blackstone's Com. Book* iv. *Chapt.* iv. *Sect.* 6*th.*

And in relation, particularly to the bringing up of Samuel before mentioned, and considered by many as the mere humbug of a woman, on the credulity of Saul, I would say—

1. That it might seem, from the history we have of king Saul, that he was a man of too much sound sense, too much experience, and too much knowledge, particularly of *witchcraft*, *divination*, &c., to be thus made the greatest dupe in the nation, by a mere woman, and notorious for her impostures, provided Saul was deceived by her accustomed legerdemain.

2. There is no intimation in the history of Samuel being thus brought up, that there was any human deception or imposture in the transaction, while the whole of it rather reads as though it were an absolute *reality*, that such a miracle was actually wrought by some invisible power, (1. Sam. 28: 3—20.)

3. It is expressly represented of this woman, by inspiration, that she had a "*familiar spirit*" (verses 3, 7, 8,) by which it is most clearly inferred that she performed this wonder, rather than by any craft merely human.

4. It is expressly said by the Holy Ghost, here, that the woman actually "SAW *Samuel*," (v. 12,) instead of her *pretending* to see him, at his coming up.

5. It is also said by the same authority, that Saul "*perceived that it* WAS *Samuel*" (v. 14,) instead of being duped to *imagine* that it was he.

6. We have, also, the proof of inspiration and of that very same Samuel which was brought up, that it was actually Samuel *himself;* in the following words of Samuel, on this very point. "*And Samuel said to Saul, why hast thou disquieted me to bring me up?*" (v. 15.) Samuel is certainly the speaker here, and his own words are very plain, that he has been brought "*up*" by the instigation of Saul.

7. Samuel himself, then, according to inspiration, proceeded to give a full prophetic communication to Saul, as he had been accustomed to do, before his death, closing his remarks, as follows:—"*And to-morrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me* [*i. e.* in death] *and the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the land of the Philistines*," (v. 19.) If we credit this whole address of Samuel and the prophecy it contains, which was immediately fulfilled just as it was given, how can we consistently say, that Samuel was not there, did not himself speak at all on the occasion, and that a crafty woman, very noted for her impostures, was only deceiving the king to make him believe human falsehoods?

I will not now be more particular on this one very signal instance of witchcraft, nor on the same "*craft*," as exhibited throughout the holy scriptures; though, according to the best human history, we have on the subject, it has prevailed as spoken of in the scriptures, in all ages of the world, and in all countries more or less, as the work of foul spirits, always standing in the way of faith in God, and directly designed by the arch deceiver to hinder the salvation of mankind. And though too many now are ready to say of it, that if it ever had an existence in the world, it is quite too late to look for any of it in "the 19th century," I would be now permitted to express my humble individual conviction, that there never was before, since the creation, so much of actual "*witchcraft*," "*divination*," &c., being practiced throughout the world, as at this very period of "the 19th century," and I shall be understood in this remark, when I say that there is overwhelming proof bearing on my mind, from revelation, from human history, and from what is now every where being witnessed in the world, that all the wonders or phenomena of MESMERISM, so called, are actually the mysteries or wonders of "*witchcraft*," and performed by the invisible power of "*familiar spirits*," and that MESMERISM in being called a science, is only "*falsely so called*." Without designing to write on this latter question, I only throw out my individual conviction concerning it, without asking the editor or any other person to bear any part of the responsibility of its being published. And should I yet be called to defend the position now assumed, I must not be slack in offering solid proof on the subject.

—

BR. WALSH'S REPLY TO BR. JONES.

1. If Mr. Jones had waited until the articles on "Witchcraft" were all published, he would have been better prepared to answer the argument advanced; or, perhaps, he might have been convinced, and thus saved the necessity of writing at all.

2. All the arguments advanced by friend Jones in the article before us, are fully met in the series of articles, to which we refer.

3. We do not design to enter into an extensive controversy on this subject, especially as other subjects of more importance claim our attention: but we will, nevertheless, introduce one or two arguments, based directly on the authority of inspiration.

4. As Egypt appears to have been the fruitful source of magic and sorcery, we will refer, in the first place, to her destiny as predicted by the Prophet Isaiah: "And the spirit of Egypt shall fail in the midst of her, and I (the Lord) will destroy (or swallow up) her *counsel:* and they shall seek to the idols, and to the charmers, and to them that have familiar spirits, and to the wizards." Ch. xix. 3d.

Here it is affirmed that the "spirit" of Egypt should fail; that they should, in other words, become dis-

pirited; and that God would destroy or swallow up her *counsel, as he did that of Saul*; and that, in this state of desperation, they should seek to the idols, the charmers, the wizards, and to those who possessed familiar spirits.

But, will friend Jones, or any other person, contend that these Egyptians obtained from "idols, charmers, familiar spirits, and wizards," the "counsel," wisdom or knowledge, which God had judicially "destroyed,' or swallowed up? And did Saul obtain that "counsel" from the witch of Endor, which God had refused to communicate by Priests, Prophets, and dreams?

5. "And when they shall say to you, seek to them that have familiar spirits, and to wizards that *peep*, and that *mutter;* should not a people seek to their God? "*For* the *living to* the *dead?* To the *law* and the *testimony:* IF THEY SPEAK NOT ACCORDING TO THIS WORD, IT IS BECAUSE THERE IS NO LIGHT IN THEM." Isaiah viii. 19, 20.

Here God, by his Prophet, tells the Jews, that, when they should be exhorted by their teachers "to seek to them that" had "familiar spirits;" "and to wizards that *peep*, and that *mutter;*" two striking features in this kind of imposture—they should reply:—"SHOULD NOT A PEOPLE SEEK TO THEIR GOD?" *Will you*, "FOR THE LIVING" SEEK "TO THE DEAD?" "To the law" of God, and his "testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."

To seek to wizards, witches, and to those who have familiar spirits, then, is to "*seek to the dead!*" It is to go to the *dead* for the benefit of the *living!* It is to consult the *dead*, who "*know nothing*," in reference to the welfare of those, who, to say the least of them, know *something!* It is to go to those who "*have no light in them;*" and to whom the light is as darkness, for the information of the living sons of men! Is it not preposterous? Is it not absurd? Yes, verily, it is superlatively so! God is the only source of life, wisdom, knowledge, and inspiration; and when He, in wrath, refuses to communicate to his creatures the things which concern their destiny, in vain will they seek to "spirits" of any sort, in Heaven, Earth, or Hades, for an expression or revelation, of his designs. "To the law and the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no *light* in them." And where there is no "*light*," there is no *truth;* and who would go to the Prince of darkness—to the "Father of *lies*," for *truth*, or information on any subject?

6. Friend Jones will do well to study the character and pretensions of Simon the Sorcerer, who gave out that he was some great person; but in all his tricks "*deceived the people*," notwithstanding they thought "he was the great power of God," and gave "heed to him from the least to the greatest."

7. Mr. Jones thinks that Saul had too much knowledge and experience to be duped by an *old woman!* Will he remember that a *wiser* than Saul, even Solomon, was duped by "outlandish women," and induced to sin.

8. The Apostle Paul classes *witchcraft* with fornication, anger, wrath, and other works of the flesh. And now permit us to state a principle, which, we believe, is perfectly invulnerable and irrefragible. ALL THE WORKS OF THE FLESH ARE ABUSES OF THE PHYSICAL, ANIMAL, MORAL, OR INTELLECTUAL POWERS OF MAN. The powers of man, of which we speak, are constitutional—they are *natural;* witchcraft, therefore, being a work of the flesh, is the abuse, or illegitimate action of some power possessed by the person assuming the character of a sorcerer, wizard, or witch.

9. We agree with Mr. Jones, that there is a vast amount of sorcery and witchcraft in the world. There are hundreds and thousands who profess to hold converse with, and to be guided by the spirits of their departed friends. There are thousands of poor, blind, deluded mortals, who daily pray to the departed ghosts of Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, and Saints, as they believe. Yes, friend Jones, THE WORLD IS FULL OF WITCHCRAFT! And this embraces *Priestcraft*, and every other spiritual abomination. But we are not willing to class animal magnetism with witchcraft, nor "philosophy falsely so-called;" for we believe that man is *magnetically made;* and that animal magnetism is a true and sublime science, beautifully unfolding the laws of life. But, we perceive that in New York, and other places, it is made a sort of foundation upon which to build the exploded hypotheses, and foolish vagaries of Swedenborg. We wish to see all these abuses corrected, and these *cobweb* systems of theology brushed away from the face of Science and Philosophy. Let us not discard truth, because the ignorant and designing abuse it. In conclusion, we would say to Mr. Jones, that we have reserved the strongest testimony, in order, should it be necessary, to make a final *raking* fire.

J. T. W.

THE SON OF GOD.—NO. III.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIVINE TESTINONY CONCERNING THE ORIGIN OF THE HIGHEST AND MOST GLORIOUS CHARACTER OF THE SON OF GOD.

BY HENRY GREW.

The term 'fellow' in Zech. 13: 7, has been supposed to denote perfect equality. Let Heb. 1: 9, be considered. Here the Son of God is said to have been annointed with the oil of gladness above his "*fellows*." Whether the term here means those "many brethren" of whom he is "the first born," or the angels of heaven, it cannot mean *perfect equality*, for the Son has "a more excellent name" than either. The primary meaning of the word fellow, is not equal, but companion.

If, then, the blessed God hath been pleased to glorify his only begotten and well beloved Son, and to accomplish his purposes of wisdom and love, by setting him at his own right hand; is it not perfectly consistent with such a design, that Jesus Christ should be distinguished with adequate titles of dignity and glory? If they were called Gods to whom the word of God came; if even a material monument of the Lord's goodness may be called by the name of Jehovah, Exod. 17: 15, are we surprised to find the Son (who is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the very image of the invisible God,) called God, over all God, &c? These appellations are perfectly appropriate. He *is* over all Ruler or God. He *is* Lord of all, for to this preeminence "God hath highly exalted him." Phil. 2: 9.

It is the delightful privilege of the redeemed, both in heaven and on earth, to ascribe "glory and dominion forever," "unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood."

Let us examine the divine testimony respecting

this holy worship. On *what account* is it offered to the Lamb? John 5: 23, 22, "For the Father judgeth no man; but hath *committed* all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." I think it must be admitted, that no passage can be found which expresses higher honor to the Son than this. And it is very remarkable that this passage which has been so often quoted as proof of the Son's supreme deity, itself contains proof to the contrary. The reason why we are to honor the Son as we do the Father, is here assigned. Is it because he "is the same numerical essence?" No, but because the Father "hath *committed* all judgment" unto him. Unless then, we say, that we honor the Father, because of authority *committed* to him, we must acknowledge that this very passage teaches us that we do not honor the Son *in all respects* as we do the Father.

Phil. 2: 9—11, "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and *given* him a name which is above every name, that at (or in) the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth; and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, *to the glory of God the Father*." How evident it is from this text, that the precious truth in its connection, that the Son of God is worshipped, not as supreme Jehovah, but on account of his great humiliation and perfect accomplishment of the mediatorial work; and that this worship is *to the glory of God the Father*.

Rev. 1: 5, 6, In this passage he is worshipped because he has loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father. Rev. 5: 12, As the Lamb that was slain. Matt. 14: 33, his disciples worshipped him as the *Son of God*. Rev. 5: 13, and 7: 10, He is worshipped in *distinction* from him that sitteth on the throne.

Shall we then, set in opposition to the divine testimony, the dictates of fallible reason, and say it is idolatry to worship him in distinction from "the only true God," who sitteth on the throne? Is it then idolatry to worship him *to the glory of God the Father*, and because the Father commands it? Shall we charge the worshippers in heaven with idolatry? It is remarkable that many Unitarians and Trinitarians, have wandered so far from what appears to be the truth, as to meet at the same point of error. Both refuse to imitate the heavenly worshippers, who worship the Lamb *in distinction* from the "most high God" who sitteth upon the throne.

The worship of the Son of God has been supposed by some to be inconsistent with the declaration of Jehovah, "My glory will I not give to another."—But what is the glory of Jehovah? Is it not the glory of *underived and independent existence*? Is it not the glory of possessing in himself *infinite perfection*; and of being, consequently the SUPREME object of the love, confidence, and worship of all intelligences? If, then, the Father, requires us to worship the Son, who is a *distinct person*, as the self-existent and independent Jehovah, it appears that *he has given his glory to another*. But if he requires us to honor and worship him *on account of all judgment or authority being* COMMITTED *to him by the Father*; and if he requires us to worship the Son "*to the glory of the Father*," it is evident that he has *not* given his glory to another.

It is admitted that it would be idolatry to worship two or more distinct persons or beings, considering them as supreme and in *all respects equal*, for this would be worshipping two or more Supreme Gods. There are many pious Trinitarians who profess to believe the divine unity, who, nevertheless, worship *three distinct equal persons*. I do humbly and seriously suggest for their solemn and candid consideration, whether this is consistent with their belief of the unity of God? And whether they can find a single precept or example for such worship in the Scriptures of truth? I beseech them to reflect, whether it is possible for them, when they are worshipping, to have an idea of *three distinct equal persons*, without having an idea of *three distinct equal beings*? Is it possible for any one to conceive of him "that sitteth on the throne," as supreme God, and of him who is at the right hand of him that sitteth on the throne, as supreme God, without conceiving of *two supreme* Gods?

The repetition of the term Holy, as in Isa. 6: 3, "Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts," has been thought by some to denote the doctrine of the Trinity. It is evident, however, that such repetition is *only significant of the importance of the subject*. Thus we read in Jer. 22: 29, O earth, earth, earth, &c. And Ezek. 21.: 27, I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, &c. Indeed it is the practice of the Hebrews to this day, to say over some of their prayers or praises three times. They have no faith in the doctrine of the Trinity.

The "Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." Whether this affords proof of supreme deity or not depends upon the question, whether this power was or was not derived from the Father? Acts 5: 31, answers this question. "Him *hath God exalted with his right hand*, to be a Prince and a Saviour for to give repentance to Israel and *forgiveness of sins*."

Matt. 28: 19—"Baptizing them," &c.

This passage in the Greek does not express the idea *by the authority of*, as in our translation; it is (*eis*) *into*, not (*en*) *in* the name of the Father &c.; i. e. into the truth, or in a profession of the truth, of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. What that truth is must be learned from other divine testimony. The passage itself does not declare or necessarily imply, that the three are one God, or that they are three persons, or that they are equal.

It has been often asked, how can Jesus be present with his assembled disciples, according to his promise, Matt. 18: 20, except he is the omnipresent Jehovah? If we consider that the Spirit is *given* him *without measure* by the Father, John 3: 34, we may easily conceive of his being spiritually present, not only in all parts of this atom of a world, but in all parts of the created universe. As the Son of God cast out devils *by the Spirit of God*, Matt. 12: 28, so by the same Spirit he is present with all true worshippers. John 3: 34, however teaches us that he is not infinite in himself, for if he was, he surely could not need anything to be given him by another.

"God is a spirit," the *only* 'eternal Spirit.' Consistently with this plain truth, we never find the Holy Spirit worshipped in distinction from the Father. If we did, we must either suppose *two eternal Spirits*, or another spirit inferior to the Father. The following passage expresses an identity of the Father and the Spirit which is totally inconsistent with distinct personality. 1 Cor. 2. 11, For what man knoweth the things of a man except the spirit of man which is in him? even, so the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God. The Apostle indeed prayed, 2 Cor. 13: 14, The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ,

and the love of God and the *communion of the Holy Ghost* be with you all. Amen. But if this is a proof of the spirit being a *distinct person*, the prayer of John, Rev. 1 : 4, appears to afford equal proof that the Spirit consists of *seven* distinct persons. In Luke 2 : 32, 35, we are taught that Jesus is the SON of the Highest and the Holy Ghost is the POWER of the Highest.

The expression "pour out," "shed forth," used in reference to the spirit of God, are additional evidences that it is not a distinct person, for such expressions are inapplicable to a person. It is true that these gracious influences proceeding from our Father in heaven, are personified, and the personal pronouns used in the case. So wisdom is personified, Prov. 8th chap. Let us candidly consider whether there can exist an infinite, intelligent, independent and omnipotent person, for the worship of whom there is not a single precept or example in all the Bible?

The pious author of those Trinitarian doxologies, which are now preferred by many Christian assemblies, to the inspired one of Rev. 5 : 13, confessed "that there is in Scripture no express precept for addressing such worship to the Spirit, nor any example of it, and that therefore this ought not to be considered as a necessary part of Christian worship; though he thought it lawful because the Spirit or power of God is truly divine." How *lawful* that worship is, for which we have neither precept or example in the *word of truth*, may be learned from "the faithful witness." John 4 : 24, God is a spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and *in truth*. John 17 : 17, *Thy word is truth*.

Alas! that christians should sit down to sing God's truth, and then stand up to sing their own tradition! Let us no longer worship according to the "precept of men," but unite in the holy anthem of celestial praise. Rev. 5 : 13, Blessing and honor and glory and power, unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.

To him that sits upon the throne,
Be honor, praise and glory given;
Loud hallelujahs to the Lamb,
By all on earth, and all in heaven.

THE THREE BATTLES.

The following communication is from BR. C. MORLEY. Though we do not agree with him in some things, particularly in relation to "the seven last plagues" being "*after* the advent," we let him speak. We are satisfied that six of the seven last plagues are already poured out, and that the seventh is near, if not already commenced.

THE FIRST BATTLE.

It seems clear to my mind, that one of the great events, just preceding the second advent of Christ, will be the restoration of a portion of the tribe of Judah to the land of their fathers; Joel 3d chap. Ezek. 34th to 38th chapter; and the gathering of the nations against them to rob them of their wealth and liberty, Ezek. 38 : 12. Zech. 14 : 1—2, which will be going on when Christ comes, Joel 3 : 16. Ezek. 38 : 19—22. Zech. 14 : 3—5. Dan. 12 : 1. *The Gog of Ezekiel will be the leader in this invasion of Palestine*, Ezek. 38 : 1—4. Gog comes from the north, verses 6, 15, Ezek. 39 : 2, which evidently is Russia, and called in Daniel 11 : 40, the king of the north. *The place of gathering.* "The valley of Jehoshaphat," Joel 3 : 2 : "against Jerusalem," Zech. 14 : 2 : "mountains of Israel," Ezek. 38 : 8; "the glorious land," Danl. 11 : 41; hence the testimony is as clear as the light of noon-day, that Palestine will be the place of gathering of the wicked nations to rob the Jews. Two nations, and the merchants of a third, refuse to join them, and charge them with being robbers, i. e., the nations of Sheba and Dedan, and merchants of Tarshish; (probably the merchants of Great Britain are meant.) Ezek. 38 : 13. At first this army of nations will have partial success, Zech. 14 : 2; 12 : 2—8 : but their triumph is short, for the Lord comes and fights against those nations, Zech. 14 : 3—4. *Manner of their destruction*; 1, their eyes, and flesh consume while they are standing; 2, they fight each other, Zech. 14 : 13; Ezek. 38 : 21; 3, "pestilence, blood and great hail stones," Ezek. 38 : 22; Isa. 29 : 5. Some of them still are left, Zech. 14 : 16; Ezek. 39 : 2. Christ's kingdom is then set up, Rev. 11 : 15; 2 Tim. 4 : 1; and the glorified saints are on the sea of glass, Rev. 15 : 2—8; the four beasts and twenty-four elders represent the joint kings with Christ, Rev. 4 : 4—11; 5 : 6—14. One of the four beasts gives unto the seven angels seven golden vials, full of the wrath of God; hence all the seven last plagues are poured out after Christ's coming.

THE SECOND BATTLE.

OR, GATHERING OF THE NATIONS TO BATTLE.

A portion of the nations still on the earth are angry and enraged at Christ's reign, (Rev. 11 : 18, 2d Psalm,) and at the plagues. Under the sixth vial, the three unclean spirits gather the nations for another battle, Rev. 16 : 13—21. OBJECTION; 15th verse, "Behold I come as a thief." ANSWER, after the New Jerusalem is on the new earth, we read Rev. 22 : 12, "Behold I come quickly," 20th verse, "Surely I come quickly;" hence the former is used in the same way as the latter. The other gathering of the nations was against the Jews; now it is against Christ, to dethrone him, Rev. 19 : 19; Gog was the leader in the first battle; but now the beast, the false prophet, and the kings of the earth lead the nations to the conflict; the glorified saints are with Christ, Rev. 19 : 14, Ps. 149 : 5—9. All this hostile multitude will be destroyed, Ps. 2 : 9, the beast and false prophet will be cast into the lake of fire alive, Rev. 19 : 20; and all the remnant will be slain by Christ, 21st verse; hence the manner of their destruction is different from that of the other battle; also a part were left of the former; but none of the latter.

THE THIRD BATTLE.

At the close of Christ's reign of a thousand years on the earth, Satan will be loosed from his prison, and will go out to deceive the nations in probation on the earth, (not the wicked dead, he is not such a stupid fool as to attempt to do that;) and he succeeds in rallying a mighty host, against the saints who are in an encampment in, and around the city, not scattered over the earth. The beloved city is not the New Jerusalem, that is not yet on the earth; but the city described by Ezekiel in 40 to 48th chapters; its circumference is 1800 reeds or 36 miles, Ezek. 40 : 30—35; it has a temple four miles in circumference, Ezek. 41 : 1—26. Satan the general is taken and cast in the same lake of fire, that the leaders in the second battle were cast, Rev. 20 : 10, and all his

followers are devoured by fire from heaven, verse 9; 2 Pet. 3: 7. The next event is the resurrection of the rest of the leaders and their doom; after which, the new earth is completed, and the New Jerusalem descends and becomes the capital of the new earth.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JUNE, 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Bible.

THE RAISING UP OF SAMUEL.—1 Saml. 28: If Samuel was actually raised up, we have no doubt it was done by "the spirits of devils, working miracles." If the view to which Brother Walsh has called attention is not the correct one, and it was not a real deception practised upon Saul, then was the Devil, "who hath the power of death" [see Heb. 2: 14,] the author of his being "brought up." Whether brought up in reality or only in pretence, it does not help, at all, the theorists who believe the dead "know more than all the world;" when the Scriptures affirm "the dead know not anything"—that "there is no knowledge in the grave," in "*sheol*," the invisible state of the dead; and, "the dead praise not the Lord."

Samuel was raised from the dead by the witch, or he was not. If he was not, then the whole matter was an illusion—a deception practised upon Saul. We are plainly told, verse 6, "And when Saul inquired of the Lord, the Lord answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." Now, if God would not answer Saul, neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by *prophets*, did he send a prophet from the dead to give him an answer? And did he employ a witch, whom he had said should not be suffered to live, to do this work? It is the same as to say, "God would *not* answer by a prophet, and yet he *did* answer by a prophet!" But suppose Samuel did actually appear—where did he come from? If he was in a conscious state of bliss in heaven he must have come down from above:—but no, he *ascended* "*out of the earth*," see v. 13. And what does he say? "Why hast thou *disquieted* me, to *bring me up?*" So, it seems, he was "disquieted," and brought "up," not *down* by this operation. Now Samuel was in heaven, or in hell, in a state of consciousness, or else he was in the grave in an unconscious state. If he was in heaven, then he gave Saul blessed news; for he told Saul, "to-morrow thou shalt be with me." So, though Saul killed himself, see chap. 31: 4, yet he went immediately to heaven. If Saul did not go to heaven, then Samuel did not tell him the truth, or else Samuel himself was in hell. If neither of these positions are true, then it follows, that Samuel, till called up, was unconscious in the grave; and that there was where he told Saul he would be "to-morrow." This could be true: but it could not be true that Saul went to heaven to be with Samuel; nor could it be true that Samuel was in hell to have Saul with him there.

"SCARLET COLOURED BEAST."

SEVENTH VIAL—FRENCH REVOLUTION.

In the last Examiner we made some remarks on passing events in Europe, as being, probably, the commencement of events under the seventh vial of the seven last plagues of Rev. 16th. The news since our last has not been of the same exciting character as the previous, but still goes to confirm and strengthen the view we then took of the subject, and that there is a strong *probability*, not certainty, that we have indeed arrived at that point in prophecy which is to develope fully the things contained in the seventh vial of the seven last plagues. We are not of the number, however, who, suppose all those developements will be made in a day, month, or *year*. We think they will, most likely, occupy several years; but we shall express no positive opinion as to the length of time they may occupy; though we are inclined to the opinion that a very few years, at most, will suffice to accomplish all those events included in Rev. 16: 17, to Rev. 20: 2.

There are some things in the 17th chapter that we are inclined to remark upon at this time, by way of suggestions. Will the reader now please turn and read that chapter. One of the seven angels having the seven last plagues there promises to show John the judgment of the great whore. This is to take place under the seventh vial: That is where the judgment on that power is to be executed. She is presented to John as a woman on a "scarlet coloured beast." Though this beast has some points of resemblance with the dragon, in the 12th chap., and the seven headed beast of the 13th chap., yet it is sufficiently distinct. The dragon has *crowns* on his *heads:* the leopard like beast, chap. 13, has *crowns* on his *horns:* the scarlet beast, chap. 17, has *no crowns* at all, and is therefore a distinct and different government from either of the others; and, besides, it occupies, in its main features, an entirely distinct period in prophetic time, though found on the same territory.

It is not so much our object to identify the woman, now, as to find out the beast that carries her; yet, it will naturally be seen what the woman is as we proceed. This beast ascends from the bottomless pit, and is to go into perdition, or be destroyed: it is "full of the names of blasphemy:" "*it was—is not*" for a time, and then "*is*" fully developed under the seventh vial: they that dwell on the earth will wonder, think it a marvellous affair, and that

great things are to be accomplished by it for good to the world, except those whose names are in the book of life: these will understand, because watching, the part this beast is to act and its end. Let the reader also observe, that this beast "is the eighth" government, in a certain line, and yet "is of the seven" that constitute the whole line of governments. We must, for the want of room to go into the discussion, at this time, assume some things which we think are capable of being demonstrated with tolerable certainty. First: We assume that the seven kings are the seven forms of government that have occupied the old Roman Empire: five of them had fallen when John had this vision, one was then in existence, namely, the Imperial, which continued in the eastern or western empire of Rome down to the beginning of the present century, when it was overthrown by Napoleon Bonaparte, by the overthrow of the Emperorship of Austria or Germany, which was the legitimate succession to the imperial power of the Cæsars in the west. Here the sixth form of Government fell, and was succeeded by a seventh, viz: an illegitimate Emperorship in the reign of Bonaparte. This seventh form of government was to "continue a short space" only; accordingly, it fell with Napoleon in 1815. The scarlet coloured beast, though the eighth, in fact, was to be "of the seven:" that is, it would include within it the seventh, though while the seventh continued it "*is not*," but "*was*" before it, and "*is*," or will be fully developed after the seventh has passed away. We are now prepared for the inquiry—What government or power is signified by the scarlet coloured beast? We give it as our opinion, with present light, that it "*was*" *atheistical France*, "full of the names of blasphemy," prior to the Bonapartean government; that it "*is not*," while the Napoleon Emperorship continued, but in reality "*yet is*," and shall be fully developed under the seventh plague. Once more the blasphemous character of atheistical France "*is*" showing itself by one of its first actions, since the late Revolution, that of fixing its elections on the Sabbath. Though we are not one of the superstitious observers of the Sabbath, yet the total disregard of the opinions of the nominal christian world by France, in fixing their first elections on that day, and postponing them from one Sabbath to another, shows that religion has nothing to expect from the French Republic. She comes up with the evidence on her face that she is the beast from the bottomless pit. This atheistical power, or beast, commenced its ascension from the bottomless pit in the French Revolution of 1789—partially developed itself, or "*was*" for a time, but being interrupted by the seventh form of Roman Government, the Bonapartean, "*is not*," for a while, but "*yet is*" now to be alive and active under the seventh and last plague, and constitutes "the eighth" form of government on the old Roman Empire, but "is of the seven," because it included in its existence, in its dormant state, the seventh, or "short space" Emperorship of Napoleon. This scarlet coloured beast is to be an enemy to all Monarchies—she will have *no crowns* on her heads or horns—she is to be Republican by profession. The woman does not sit upon the *body* of this beast, but upon its heads, verse 9; and "the seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth;" clearly indicating Rome, or Italy, as the position of the heads of this beast. If this be true, and we are under the seventh vial, there will soon be a union or confederacy between France and Italy; for the ten horns are upon the *head* of the scarlet coloured beast; of course will be found in Italy: these, having united Italy in *one* confederacy, which is to take place at the same hour, or *time* with the beast's coming fully into power, will "agree and give their kingdom to the beast"—atheistical France. There are indications, even now, that such a confederacy is to be formed in Italy as shall answer to the propheey in calling the dominion of the ten horns "their kingdom," or one; which, then, by agreement, is to be given to the beast and will complete its developement. We clip the following from one of the items of foreign news.

"The following are the bases of a treaty said to have been concluded between the Pope, the King of Sardinia, and the Grand Duke of Tuscany, for the future organization of Italy. The Italian Peninsula to be divided into six great States. 1. Naples. 2. Sicily. 3. States of the Church. 4. The kingdom of Etruria, for the advantage of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, to consist of the actual Grand Duchy, and the adjoining territories of Pontremoli, Modena, Piertasmante, and Lunigiana. 5. Lombardy, under whatever form of Government the Lombards may adopt. 6. Sardinia, with an indemnity to King Charles Albert in case Savoy should be annexed to France. An alliance offensive and defensive between the six States. An Italian confederation well defended by a line of fortresses along the frontiers. A uniform law for weights, measures, and currency. Abolition of internal duties. A Diet at Rome under the presidency of the Pope."

It may be observed that the 4th of these "six States" includes *five* divisions, which if numbered with the others makes ten in all; thus giving indications that if the "ten horns," or kingdoms, are not already manifest they may soon be developed. When developed, and consolidated in one "confederation," will be the time for them to "agree and give their power, strength and kingdom to the scarlet coloured beast;" then will that beast be fully organized. The ten horns, or different divisions of Italy, from some cause, which will ere long appear, will hate the woman (corrupt church) and make her desolate and naked, and eat her flesh and burn her with fire; strip her of all her power, authority and riches. It may be because that church will

not enter fully into their plans. After the coalition of the horns with the beast the atheistical character of this power will be more fully discovered; for it is, when consolidated, to "make war with the Lamb." Hence this beast, in his union with the ten horns, is to continue till the second advent of Christ, unto whom "the Lord God will give the throne of his father David" that "all nations shall serve and obey him." But this atheistical, blasphemous beast, mis-named *republican*, France and all its confederates, will make war against Christ and dispute his authority to reign over all nations; but the Lamb, or Christ the "King of kings, and Lord of lords," will be the Conqueror; verse 14: and the atheistical beast, with all its adherents, will "go into perdition," or destruction: that is—that blasphemous power will be utterly destroyed.

The saints, or those "whose names were in the book of life," did not "wonder," or marvel, when they saw this beast arise, though others did who dwelt on the earth. The saints had learned from the prophecy that such a beast would arise—and they learned what was to be its end. The appearance of that beast, therefore, was to them a sure token of the soon coming and victory of their long absent Lord.

The foregoing hints are thrown out, not as the matured thoughts of our mind, but as suggestions that seem naturally to arise from passing events; and to induce christians to study carefully prophecy in connection with the history of the times in which we live. Our Lord rebuked the Scribes and Pharisees for "not discerning the signs of the times." Let us beware lest we come under the same censure. How can we tell what part we are to act, unless we see clearly where we are in the fulfilment of prophecy. We are in danger, in these days of excitement, of joining in the attempted glorification of the beast from the bottomless pit. Let us look for our coming Lord, and see to it that we are found under his banner, not with carnal, or political weapons, but with those described by Paul, Eph. 6: 11—18.

"Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood; but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breast-plate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints."

"FANCY" SKETCHES.

The following fancy sketch we find in several of our exchange papers. Well does the writer say, "I have often *fancied*," for he has not a particle of Scripture evidence for "*faith*" in such sublime flights. The article is headed "*Friends in Heaven.*" The writer, it will be seen, speaks of his mother as "the heart enshrined *idol* of" his "earlier years." In that we cannot doubt he speaks the truth, and that is probably the reason why he makes her *a god* now that she is dead. But we let him speak for himself. He says:—

"I bless God for the hope I am permitted to entertain that I have a mother—the heart enshrined idol of my earlier years—whose spirit wanders in a cloud of glory, through the aromatic gardens and over the delectable mountains of the blest. She spent here below a life of sorrow—wedded to privations, disappointments and disease; but now she plucks the fragrant flowers and the delicious fruits of paradise; leans her own weary head upon the bosom of Jesus, and slumbers in the beatific vision of the throne of God. I have often fancied, in hours of darkness and despondent gloom, that her glorified spirit lingered around me, whispering words of consolation and hope.

"And to have *children* in heaven! Are they not golden knobs, which transmit the electric spark of divine love from the throne of the lamb to the burdened and disconsolate soul? Bereaved parents could you now behold the babe which has perished like a blossom from your arms, you would scarcely recognize the sickly infant which demanded your unceasing care and unslumbering watchfulness. It has changed its toys for an angelic lute; its sobs for a song of triumph, and its little grief and acute pains for the sweetness of seraphic joy and the rapture of undying praise. And then, what astonishing advances has it already made in all the elements of knowledge and wisdom and love!

"Glory to God that we have friends in heaven! Parents, husbands, wives, children, brothers, sisters, and associates have gone before us. They have proved by their own experience, that 'life and immortality are brought to light in the gospel.' They await our arrival on those blissful shores."

We also clip from one of the same exchange papers this additional outbreak of fancy:

"There is a glorious world of light,
Above the starry sky;
Where saints departed, clothed in white
Adore the Lord most high.

"And hark!—amid the sacred songs
Those heavenly voices raise,
Ten thousand, thousand infant tongues
Unite in perfect praise.

"Those are the hymns that we shall know,
If Jesus we obey;
That is the place where we shall go,
If found in wisdom's way."

Now, dear reader, are not such *very pretty* specimens of fancy too good to be spoiled? How very comforting! Away to glory at death! No need of

a resurrection—what a useless affair that would be! And then, why make any words about Christ's coming again, seeing "we shall go above the starry sky" when we die, and "wander in a cloud of glory, through the aromatic gardens and over the delectable mountains"? And yet, strange to tell, the same paper that contains these "delectable" morsels, contains an article on the resurrection, in which the writer says: "*Without a resurrection all nature is involved in mystery.*" How true is this remark; and yet how completely irreconcileable with the foregoing fancy sketches. One speaks the language of the Bible—the other the language of Pagan Philosophy.

Let God be true though all men should prove to be mistaken. His word declares:

"The dead praise not the Lord." Psa. 115: 17. "In death there is no remembrance of thee." Psa. 6: 5. "Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise and praise thee? Selah. Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" Psa. 88: 10--12. "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Psa. 146: 4. "But man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and dryeth up: So man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Job. 14: 10, 12. "The dead know not any thing—also their love, hatred, and envy is now perished." Eccl. 9: 5, 6. "There is no work, nor device, nor *knowledge* in the grave [Hebrew; *Sheol;* the state of the dead—the invisible state of dead men] whither thou goest." Eccl. 9: 10. "If the dead rise not—then they which have fallen asleep in Christ are perished." 1 Cor. 15: 16, 18. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with these words." 1 Thess. 4: 13, 18. "The meek shall inherit the earth." Psa. 37: 11; and Matt. 5: 5.

Here we see the true ground of hope and comfort for our friends who have fallen asleep in Christ. It is in the resurrection, at the coming of Christ—"at the last day." And this hope is as distinctly opposed to the fancy sketches of modern theology as the Bible is opposed to Pagan fables; or as the *earth* differs from the fancied "world above the starry sky." These fancy sketches declare that the dead, small and great, "unite in *perfect praise;*" but, the Holy Spirit declares, "*The dead praise not the Lord.*" How long will even good men credit heathen philosophy instead of the explicit testimony of the Scriptures of Truth. We fear they will continue to do it till the sectarian scales fall from their eyes, so that they shall regard the authority of God more than the creeds of men. The whole of this corruption of the words of the Most High grows out of the "immortal soul" theory. Starting wrong with their foundation, it is no wonder they build "wood, hay, and stubble." Let them begin the Book of God with a mind willing to follow the truth wherever it shall lead them, and the first three chapters of Genesis will satisfy them that man is not immortal; and that immortality, if it is ever possessed by man, must be the gift of God's favour through the second Adam. The New Testament clearly settles that point, and assures us if we ever attain unto it, it is by a patient continuance in well doing, *seeking for it.* See Rom. 2: 7; and 6: 23.

Since the above was written, we find the following additional morsel of sublime Paganism, in one of our daily papers, after the notice of the death of a lady:

"Now in her snow-white shroud she lies,
Her lily lids half veil her eyes,
As if she looked with wild surprise
Up at her soul in Paradise.
Her hands lie folded on her breast,
Crossed like the cross that gave her rest,
She looks as if some heavenly guest
Had told her that her soul was blest."

This is a rare specimen of modern theology, or immortal-soulism. Here soul and body both are made to be conscious in death. The body is looking "up at her soul in Paradise;" but, not being able to trust its eyes, a "Heavenly guest" is sent to talk to the body and tell it "her soul is blest"!!! Most excellent theology! The outbreak of the bosom of some minister of fancy, with which the present age abounds. If the words of God, Most High, are not turned into fables by the teaching of immortal-soulists, at least fables are substituted for His words.

While we are on this subject we will give our readers a fancy sketch that fell from the lips of one of the most eminent and popular ministers in this city not long since. He said:

"There are millions in that world of glory that once lived here. Heaven is made up of little colonies filled with those we loved on earth, looking down on us from above the stars. That mother in heaven when she sees her son, on earth, coming back to God, how her heart swells—she gives a shout of joy in high heaven."

Tremendous! Why had not the preacher told us which "colony" was the largest! And how far "above the stars" they were located! And then, what tremendous eye-sight they must have to see all the way back to earth! "Looking down upon

us!" We must look pretty small so far off! Some of the "stars" are supposed to be more than a thousand times larger than this earth; and yet, to us, they are hardly visible; but these immortal souls, up in those "colonies above the stars," can not only see this earth, but see "us" they have left behind! And then the "mother" had a motherly feeling up there for "sons on earth;" and when they are "coming back to God she gives a shout of joy in high heaven!" Why had not this fancy maker told us what that mother did when she saw another "son" die and sink down in "endless torments?" Did she give a *groan* "in high heaven?" But, we turn from such disgusting fancies to the sure word of God, where we learn that "*The dead praise not the Lord*"—that, they "*go down to silence*"—that, if it were not for the resurrection they are "perished"—that our only hope for those "that have fallen asleep in Christ" is, that their Lord "will raise them up at the last day." Common sense and Scripture truth will sometimes flash out from behind the regions of fancy, like the lightning from a tempest cloud. In the same paper from which we cut the last scrap of poetic fancy, we find, after the notice of the death of a mother, the following effusion of truth:

"Rest, sweet mother, rest in slumber,
Until the resurrection morn;
Then arise and join the number,
Who thy triumph shall adorn."

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.—NO I.

TO ALL WHO LOVE OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST *we dedicate the following remarks on Human Creeds and Tests of Christian Fellowship, in hope that you may give them at least* ONE *prayerful reading.*

I. HUMAN CREEDS LACK AUTHORITY IN THEIR ORIGIN.

It must be admitted by all, that the compilers, or authors of these creeds were not *inspired* men. If they were not inspired, they were like ourselves, *fallible*. Where, then, is their *authority* for imposing upon others, a rule, or test, of Christian character, and deciding that a man is not sound in the faith who dissents from their creed, while his *conduct* and *temper* are as *Christ-like* as their own? Our Heavenly Father, himself, has not claimed assent to His Word without giving us the most astonishing miracles in proof that it is His own truth. Can *Creed-makers* show any such proofs in favor of the *test* creeds they have produced? Where is the evidence, except it be found in the fact, that the language of their creeds is *discordant?* We will not call in question the *motives* of many who have originated these creeds; they have *designed* to keep the church pure; but they have shown the weakness of human nature when it undertakes to sit in the place of God.

It will be admitted that our gracious God foresaw all the possible *heresies* that could afflict His church to the end of the world; and, if He has not done it, *He could* have provided a creed, infallible in its nature, sufficient for every case of heresy that could occur. *Such a creed*, we believe he has provided; viz. *the Bible*. And He has given no evidence that any man since the days of the apostles, is appointed, by Him, to take a "*'bird's-eye'* view of indispensable truth," and make that a test of our Christian regard. All these human creeds, then, are *destitute of authority in their origin;* and, for this cause, if for no other, *should be rejected.*

II. THEY ARE CALCULATED TO DECEIVE AND BEWILDER.

The authors of them do not *agree* among themselves; hence, the creeds may well be named *'legion,'* for they *'be many.'* A man in determining which is right, has to hear arguments from all sides. In hearing the various and conflicting sentiments, urged with all the zeal that a bigoted attachment to a particular mode of explanation can inspire, his mind is likely to be *bewildered;* and it would not be strange if he should come to the conclusion, that the *Bible itself* is a 'cunningly devised fable,' and no more to be relied upon than these conflicting creeds.

Besides these creeds are not only unlike each other, but they are perpetually undergoing modifications or change. *Truth can not change;* hence, these creeds were *not true before*, or they are not true *now*. They are fashioned, modeled and remodeled, as certain men choose, and are as uncertain guides as the *ignis fatuus*. *The Bible, alone*, shines with effulgence and glory like the *sun* in the midst of these shooting meteors. Follow the clear shining of *God's Creed*—the Bible—and the path shall be that of the *just*, shining more and more unto the perfect day; follow human creeds, and it will be next to a miracle if men are not lost in inextricable confusion. Men judge of each other, not by the sure test of *love* to *God and man*, but by the creed they have adopted. Hence it often happens, that a real child of God is rejected because he has subscribed to an opposite creed to ours, while, perhaps, a hypocrite is embraced as a dear brother; for, he is of '*our faith and order*.' Is this not to be *deceived and bewildered?*

III. THE REQUIREMENTS OF HUMAN CREEDS ARE UNREASONABLE.

1. *They require us to believe without evidence.* That is they do not afford evidence *in themselves* of the truth of what they affirm. They attempt to state what the authors suppose is truth; but, they have nothing in themselves in proof of their positions. To demand assent under such circumstances is unreasonable in the highest degree. It is a demand which God himself has made upon no man.

2. They are unreasonable in their requirements, because, *they require all to believe alike on all points stated in them.* They make no allowance for weakness of understanding—prejudice of early education, or any other unavoidable circumstances.—The man who has but *one* talent, is to assent to just as much as a man with *five* or *ten* talents; the *babe* in Christ, to as much, and *the same* as a father; the *weak* is to have his mind reined up to pronounce the same *'yea;'* on the *highest points* in theology, as the *strongest;* and all this too, when, perhaps, they have just passed from death unto life, and at the very outset of that "*knowledge*" in which the Bible commands them to "*grow.*" Was ever anything more unreasonable? We might as well make it a condition to a new-born babe, of remaining in its family, that it should do the work of a full grown child, or solve the problems of Euclid.

3. Their demands are unreasonable, because, *they circumscribe us in the pursuit of knowledge.*

They assume that they are correct in themselves, and have the "*essential* and *fundamental*" truths of God's Word embodied; and hence, every one who assents to them is constantly hedged in by *the creed*, and must take care how he looks over his prison walls to examine opposing views, unless he does it with an intention of making war on them; he must not, for a moment, indulge the suspicion, that *possibly* he may be *wrong*, and his neighbor *right:* whatever his convictions may be, he must, if he would maintain his *standing*, where he is, affirm, *our creed* is the *true one*. The Scriptures condemn those who "*take away the key of knowledge.*" Human creeds virtually do this, by assuming that they contain the *fundamental* and *essential* truths of the Gospel, and that a man cannot *obtain* or *retain* a standing in their community who presumes to overstep their ipse dixit. The creed, then, with the weight of influence accompanying it rests upon the mind like an incubus to prevent its efforts for knowledge, except in the direction and under the control of this human invention.

Inspiration saith, "Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." "Not so," answer our creed makers, "we have what is essential and fundamental in our bird's-eye view," and depend upon it, the *moral world* is "*flat*," and the man is unworthy our church fellowship that believes "it revolves on its own axis." That is, in plain English, the man that thinks one jot ahead of us is next door to a heretic, and not to be tolerated in the same church with us. Are not, then, their requirements unreasonable? So it appears to us; and had such requirements been yielded to, we might still have been in the darkness of the middle ages, from which we have scarcely yet emerged.

"WHY WILL YE DIE?"

Such is the gracious expostulation of our Father in heaven to his perishing children, who, by transgression have exposed themselves to the penalty of his holy law, which is "DEATH." "*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*" O, let us hearken to the voice of his love! He assures us that he has given his own Son to die for us, that whosever believeth on him might not perish but have everlasting life, and kindly asks, "Why will ye die?" "As I live saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but rather that he turn and live. Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?"

O the remorse that will agonize the man that is now preferring the perishing riches, or honours, or pleasures of this transitory state, to all the ravishing glories of Immortality, when he shall see Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all the humble followers of the Lamb in the Kingdom of God, and he himself thrust out!

O ye whose hope will be as the spider's web, because ye purify not yourselves as Christ is pure; ye who have a name to live and are dead, who have the form of godliness without its power; ye who lay up for yourselves treasures upon earth, and are not rich towards God, be kindly entreated to pause one solemn moment. Is it possible that, with the voice of eternal truth warning you so fearfully, "Except ye repent (reform) ye shall *perish*;" that you will continue to deprive yourselves of all the inconceivable and interminable joys of God's everlasting kingdom, to be destroyed, "soul and body in hell," for the sake of a momentary gratification in the idolatrous possession of the vanities of the present world! What will it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his life forever? Who can estimate the gain of losing our present life for Christ's sake, and finding it in life eternal? *Why will ye die?* H. GREW.

CREED POWER.—The following is from a sermon published by a son of Rev. Dr. Lyman Beecher:—

"There is nothing imaginary in the statement that the Creed-Power is now beginning to prohibit the Bible, as really as Rome did, though in a subtler way. During the whole course of seven years' study, the Protestant candidate of the ministry sees before him an unauthorized statement, spiked down and stereotyped, of what he MUST find in the Bible, or be martyred. And does any one, acquainted with human nature, need be told that he studies under a tremendous pressure of motive? Is that freedom of opinion—the 'liberty wherewith Christ maketh free?'—Rome would have given that. Every one of her clergy might have studied the Bible to find the Pontifical Creed, on the pain of Death. Was that liberty?

"Hence, I say, that liberty of opinion in our Theological Seminaries is *a mere form.* To say nothing of the thumb-screw of criticism, by which every original mind is tortured into negative propriety, the whole boasted liberty of the student consists in a choice of chains—a choice of handcuffs—whether he will wear the Presbyterian handcuff, or Methodist, Baptist, Episcopal, or other evangelical handcuff. Hence it has now come to pass, that the ministry themselves dare not study their Bible. Large portions thereof are seldom touched. It lies useless lumber; or if they do study and search, they dare not show their people what they find. There is something criminal in saying anything new. It is shocking to utter words that have not the mould of age upon them."

RENOUNCEMENT OF SECTARIANISM.—The body of Christians formerly known as the "*Liberty Street Presbyterian Church of Troy, N. Y.,*" unanimously passed the following resolutions on Sunday, March 5th.

Whereas, Sectarianism is at variance with the spirit and letter of the Gospel, and is the foundation of ecclesiastical oppression, and is a most prolific source of wars and slavery, and many other oppressions that afflict the world; therefore,

Resolved, That the members of Christ's body, heretofore denominated "The Liberty Street Presbyterian Church of Troy, N. Y.," do hereby solemnly repudiate all sectarianism, sincerely regretting before God and man that we ever gave countenance to that destructive device of Satan.

Resolved, That we shall hereafter be known as "*The Church in Liberty Street, Troy, N. Y.,*" and that we shall acknowledge no other *creed* than the Bible, and no other Head than God and his Son Jesus Christ.

Resolved, That God has but one Church on the earth, and that it is composed of all such as love him and keep his commandments; and that these, in their Church relations, are equal in rights and liberty. Signed by

HENRY H. GARNET.

LETTERS.

CHARLES FITCH, ONCE MORE.

The following letter is the first we received from that dear brother after he made up his mind to put shoulder to the yoke with us on the topics therein named. If we published it at the time it was received we have no paper containing it, and now publish it from the original manuscript. We have not seen it for four years past, till a few days since, and accidentally found it among papers we had laid aside. It seemed as though just uttered, and we determined to give it to our readers. It is even to-day like cold water to a thirsty soul. "He being dead yet speaketh."

CLEVELAND, Ohio, Jan. 25, 1844.

Dear Bro. Storrs:—As you have long been fighting the Lord's battles alone, on the subject of the state of the dead, and of the final doom of the wicked, I write this to say that I am at last, after much thought and prayer, and a full conviction of duty to God, prepared to take my stand by your side.

I am thoroughly converted to the Bible truth, that "*the dead know not anything*," and that all the instances in the Bible in which they are spoken of as though in a conscious state, are instances in which "God who quickeneth the dead, calleth the things which *be not* as though *they were*." Particular instances of this are seen in God's reference to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob at the bush; in the Saviour's parable of the rich man and Lazarus; in the case of the saints, as in Revelation, looking forward to the time when they shall reign on the earth, and crying to God from under the altar for vengeance, as the blood of Abel cried to God from the ground. Another instance is found in the 37th chap. of Ezekiel, where the "whole house of Israel, a *valley of dry bones*, EXCEEDING DRY," are represented as saying, "our bones are dried, our hope is lost." In all these cases, God, who will quicken the dead, has called the things which be not as though they were.

"God hath" also "chosen things which are not, to bring to nought the things which are." That is, the saints who now are not, will be raised at the Lord's coming, and with Christ will execute vengeance upon all the wicked of the earth, and thus bring to nought the things which now are. This will be the stone cut out without hands, to smite the image on its feet, when all these kingdoms will be broken in pieces and consumed. I am also fully satisfied that, "when the wicked spring as the grass, and when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they *shall be destroyed forever*; and *that* language must mean, what it would mean in any other book, in relation to any other thing—that was to be destroyed. It means that their "*end is destruction*;" "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His power." If God's presence fills the universe, and the glory of His power is everywhere to be seen in His works, then, throughout all the presence and works of God, we "may diligently consider" the "place of the wicked and it shall not be." You are right Brother Storrs, we shall have a *clean universe*. Thanks be to God. You can use this letter in any way, so that it speaks out. I shall not put my light under a bushel. I have preached two sermons here this week on this subject. They have produced a great uproar. Many *thought* I had a devil before, but now they feel sure of it. But I have no more right, my Brother, to be ashamed of God's truth on this subject than on any other. I have not taken ground on these great truths hastily or waveringly. I have felt every inch of it, and I know it is as firm as God our eternal rock; and I wish all our advent brethren to know where I stand, and all the world besides. I know that our mighty, coming Lord will take his fan, and thoroughly purge his floor, gather the wheat into the garner, and *burn up* the chaff with unquenchable fire. "Even so, come Lord Jesus."

Lest I be misunderstood—I wish to say, very distinctly, that all the wicked must come forth from their graves to the resurrection of damnation; and have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone which is the *second death*, and there be "*utterly consumed*," see 73d Ps.

"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection, on such the second death hath no power." Your Brother in the Glorious Hope,

CHARLES FITCH.

THE LEAVEN AT WORK:—A minister of the Gospel, in one of the organised denominations, of high standing among his brethren, writes us, "not for the public eye," but yet we cannot forbear giving an extract, while we withhold his name and residence. He says:—

BR. STORRS:—I have long had it in contemplation to write you a few lines, but have hitherto neglected to do so. You have had the goodness to send me your Bible Examiner, which, I assure you, has been thankfully received, and read with interest. Though it contains some things which I either do not fully understand or cannot endorse, yet, on the whole, I read it with more interest than almost any other paper. I am with you on the literal interpretation of Prophecy, the return of the Jews, Probation after the Advent, &c.

I am much exercised on the final state of the wicked, and the state of the dead. I strongly incline to your views—indeed, I have been shaken in my belief of the popular theory ever since I read your first pamphlet. I confess myself unable to refute your arguments, and yet I have rather shrunk from the full and open admission of the correctness of your views. I am prayerfully investigating, and hope to be lead into all truth.

DR. J. F. LEE, Meltonsville, N. C., writes:—

BR. STORRS:—I shall endeavor ere long to extend the spread of your "Six Sermons." I intend as some writers say, to flood the country with them. They have already excited no small commotion among a certain class of preachers and deacons, who say that they do not wish to believe the doctrine even if it should be true! Alas! how some seek applause—with what untiring zeal they court popularity, thirsting for the honor that comes from man! The Lord open their eyes, that they may see. But so it is—and so it is written. We certainly must be approaching the end of all things—or in other words, the end of all things must be nigh. What a blessed feeling is that of the Christian who has a lively, living Hope—looking for that blessed

hope, and the glorious appearing of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.

I am a firm believer in the second Advent doctrine as unfolded in the Bible. I am persuaded from the compulsive influence of truth, that the New Heaven and New Earth constitute the Kingdom of God, or the Paradise of God; that unless a man is born again he cannot enter that Kingdom—that the New Birth includes the Redemption of the Body—that it will be completed or perfected in the Resurrection; and I know that Christians love one another—that love is the fulfilling of the law—that without faith it is impossible to please God—that in order to be saved, we must believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and love one another as he gave us commandment—that we love Him because he first loved us.

In 1836 I made a profession of Religion, united with the Baptists—and was ordained in 1837. At present I desire to be at perfect liberty to preach a doctrine which I see clearly revealed in letters of living light. I know I love the truth, and feel assured that, by the grace of God, I am willing to suffer for the sake of *Him* who is Truth. You may expect to hear from me in the course of a few weeks, when I shall have the pleasure of forwarding to you some subscribers, and money.

—

Br. L. W. Beach, Middleburg, Ind., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—Having become, of late, a convert to the doctrine advocated in your Examiner of the sleep of the dead and the final destruction of the wicked, and given up the hope of a heaven "beyond the skies," without latitude or longitude, for *the hope of the Gospel*, I am endeavoring to "show my faith by my works." I am aware that my talent is but one, and that perhaps small. But as I have received much valuable information from your paper, from the few Nos. I have received since I became a subscriber, by lending those, I am enabled to send you more subscribers.

My Examiners are getting some worn by lending, and perhaps I had better lay claim to your promise to send us new ones for them. I will endeavor to send you more subscribers soon. May the Lord help you to examine and promulgate his truth. Yours, waiting for the Kingdom.

—

Sist. Mary A. Ordway, Uxbridge, Mass., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—I have much that I might say in favor of your invaluable paper; but, let it suffice to say—it seems to me like green and fertile spots in the midst of a dry and barren desert. I often-times feel that the former is almost as necessary to my future progress, as is the latter to the traveller of the arid deserts of Africa.

Yours, in hope of immortality.

—

Br. Elon Everts, Vergennes, Vt., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—In '44 when you visited Vermont and spoke of the "wages of sin, which are death;" and death was not life; but destruction, decomposition, smoke and ashes, unconsciousness; I had never investigated the subject. I could only quote, "these shall go away, into everlasting *punishment*," the "smoke of their torment ascendeth up *forever* and *ever*;" "worm dieth not, and fire is not quenched," &c., but understood not by the word of God, what I should have learned by these passages, had I went to the right source in a prayerful, teachable frame of mind. And the brethren in this region were in darkness at that time, as to this subject; and although they were anxious to hear you, on the coming of the Lord, they almost wished that you would consult their feelings as to this soul-thrilling subject.

Now brother, the brethren in this vicinity who are looking for the coming of the Lord, are rejoicing in this truth. Yes, I can say that it affords me comfort to think that God will have a clean Universe; and if through Christ I shall be permitted to enter that Eden-restored land, that I shall not have my peace annoyed by beholding my near friends or neighbors who have slighted and despised all my feeble prayers and tears, the counsels of God's word, and the drawings of his tender spirit, writhing in everlasting life of torment and misery. No, God has said that He would not be angry always. Br., you turned my mind to look at what would be done at, and after Christ's second advent, and what would be the condition of the wicked that knew not God, and obeyed not the gospel, and the heathen that shall be left after that time of trouble, spoken of by Dan. 12th, Zeph. 3d, and Zech. 14th chap., and many other scriptures; which has comforted my soul: it has fed me many otherwise doubtful, anxious hours. Yes, Br., during this long halt of the whole line of the expecting children, to pass the land, I have many glorious shouts in searching the land, and eating the grapes of Eschol; and telling the children not to fear; that they are able through their spiritual Joshua to possess the land. The trump will soon sound, and Jericho's walls (the Kingdom of this world) will fall: and the Rahabs (the heathen, they that are left) will be remembered in mercy; Isa. 60: 3, 10; 61: 5, Zech. 14: 16, Zeph. 3: 12, 13.

I am glad to read your paper, to hear of your love for truth, which I doubted not; of your determination to scatter light. May God aid you, and bless you in it. I controvert not with any. I have learned, that to be untraditionized, is a great work. I want to hear, may I have ears to hear. I pray that I may not possess a censorious, but kind spirit, toward all. But, oh, the esteeming one above another, and puffing up one, as I see in the many letters to certain Editors; paying a certain homage; it looks like loving to call, and love to be called master.

—

Br. David Plumb, Troy, N. Y., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—All religion is to be embodied in *practical life*—in maintaining human rights—in promoting human interests. The final and decisive question that will be put to men of all nations, whether nominally Christians, Jews, Mahomedans, or Pagans, will be, "Have you fed the hungry—clothed the naked—visited the sick and imprisoned?" The doing these things, (which summarily comprehend the whole class of duties to our fellow men,) the doing them *uniformly*, and from the principle of obedience to the great social law—"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"—is the end of the "Law and the Prophets," as it is the true expression and fulfilment of the Gospel. The triumph and universal establishment in the kingdom of Christ of the law of brotherhood, from which those merciful acts spring, will constitute the consummation of the Messiah's mission to this world. The expounding and applying that law is, therefore, of *paramount consideration*—a *chief work* of preachers and editors, as, indeed, of every Christian; while the *mediation* is the means by

which we are to be *restored to that law;* and, the Advent—the end of the wicked—and immortality of the righteous, are only so many *motive influences* to induce us to seek that *restoration.*

I should be glad to see this practical view of the Gospel more *specifically* spread out on the pages of the Examiner. If we are ever permitted to enter into the social state under Christ, it must be on condition that we become *conformed to the law of that state* NOW; and the proof that we are conformed to it must be found in the fact that we maintain it in *all our present relations to our fellow men.*

—

BR. BENJ. TILLEY, JR., Bristol, R. I., writes:—

BR. STORRS:—The ground you have taken upon the Prophetic Periods I consider very important to us who have been looking with so much interest to their ending as the point at which the Christian's hope is to be realized. I must confess that when I have examined the Prophesies relating to the restoration from the Babylonish captivity, and find the person named who should say to his people, "go free," and "to Jerusalem, thou shalt be built," I have been at a loss to find the ground for placing that decree in the reign of Artaxerxes; but, I am not well read enough in the history of those times to decide whether there is sufficient ground for your placing the reign of Cyrus where you have. I am striving to keep myself open to conviction, and ready to receive light from whatever source it may come, without regard to former opinions or prejudices, whether expressed or not.

Yours, in hope of Eternal Life.

—

BR. WM. ONGLEY, Onondaga Co., N. Y., writes:—

BR. STORRS:—We believe we shall soon be delivered, and the saints will take the kingdom, and reign with Jesus for ever, Amen. Thank God, we hear the thrones begin to be cast down; next the Ancient of days will sit. Men's hearts are failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; next we shall see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory; then we that are alive (and remain) shall be changed in a moment, and be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and so ever be with the Lord. Comfort one another with these words. We will praise the Lord, and wait for his appearing from heaven. Last winter and spring myself and wife have been labouring in Chemung and Steuben Cos., N. Y., and are about to return. There are many calls to hear the doctrine of the coming kingdom. We are bold to proclaim eternal life for the children of God, and death to the wicked, and that the dead know not anything. I have sold many dozens of your "Six Sermons," and am happy to say the sermons and other works on those subjects, it seems to me, are doing the last work. I have been witness of their happy effects; it is like a two-edged sword, because it is God's word. Myself and wife have to confess in 1843 and '44 we were afraid to look at it and examine that question. Oh, praise the Lord for all His truth; it seems to me almost impossible to preach the Second Advent of our Lord and the resurrection *without it;* for it harmonizes the whole chain of God's word.

I thought I ought to tell you what God is doing through your Sermons on the End of the Wicked and State of the Dead. My prayer to God is that you may be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord.

I remain your Brother in Christ, waiting for our deliverance and our King from Heaven.

—

BR. ASA MORSE, Union, Ct., writes:—

BR. STORRS:—We have felt interested mainly in your paper for the truth it contains concerning the state of the dead and destruction of the wicked; and I would say for your encourgement, that almost without exception the Advent brethren and sisters in this region of country are firm believers in the above truths: also concerning the truth that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.

☞THE EDITOR of this paper preaches every Lord's day at COMMISSIONERS HALL, Third street, below Green, east side; at 10, A. M., and in the evening at a quarter before 8 o'clock.

THE "SIX SERMONS" on the End of the Wicked, &c., can be had at No. 21 North Sixth street, or of the Author, 18 Chester street, between Race and Vine, 8th and 9th. Price, in Pamphlet, 15 cents, or ten copies for $1.00. The pamphlet includes the views of the author on the question, "Have the dead knowledge?" The Sermons advocate the doctrine, that "All the wicked will God *destroy,*" or, cause them to cease from life, after the judgment. The work full bound in morocco, with Grew's thoughts on the Intermediate State, 37½ cents. Cash in all cases with the order.

THE ASPECTS OF PHRENOLOGY ON REVELATION; or, *Materialism, Fatalism, Regeneration, Creeds, Atheism, The operation of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of men,* and HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY, *Philosophically considered, in a series of Lectures,* BY J. T. WALSH." Such is the Title of an Octavo pamphlet of 74 pages, published by Br. Walsh, Richmond, Va., 1846. For sale at 21 North Sixth street, Philadelphia, Pa. *Price 25 cents,* or five copies for one dollar, thirty copies for five dollars. Cash always with the order.

DR. DRAKE'S PANACEA; THE ONLY RADICAL CURE FOR CONSUMPTION. It also removes and permanently cures all diseases arising from an impure state of the blood.

The following is but one of the certificates we have received, showing the virtues of this invaluable medicine:

Philada. Dec. 12, 1847.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your question respecting the use of Dr. DRAKE'S PANACEA, I would say, I have used it in two very inveterate cases, pronounced by the attending physicians to be Pulmonary Consumption, and abandoned by them as incurable. One of the persons had been under the treatment of several very able practitioners for a number of years, and they said she had "old fashioned Consumption combined with Scrofula," and that she might linger for some time, but could not be permanently relieved. In both cases the effect of the Panacea has been most gratifying. I will only add that familiar as I am with consumption by inheritance and by extensive observation as a study, and knowing also the injurious effects in nine cases out of ten of tar, bone-set, and other vegetable tonics, as well as many of the expectorants and sedatives, I should never have recommended the use of Drake's Panacea, if I had not been acquainted with the ingredients. Suffice it to say that these are recommended by our most popular and scientific physicians, and in their present combined state form probably the best alterative that has ever been made.

Very respectfully, yours, I. C. GUNN,
Corner Chestnut & Fifth St.

Each bottle has the signature of Geo. F. Storrs, and the name, Dr. Drake's Panacea, blown in the glass.

Prepared only by STORRS & CO., Druggists, No. 21 N. Sixth Street.

AGENTS.—Brooklyn, N. Y., Mrs. Hayes, 139 Fulton St.; New York City, No. 5 Beckman St.; Harrisburg, Pa., M. Lutz, Lancaster, Heinitsh & Son: Danville. Wm. Murray & Co; Chambersburg, J. W. Douglass; Pottsville, J. G. Brown; York, C. A. Morris & Co.; Columbia, R. Williams; Carlisle, J. M. Kneedler; Bristol, L. A. Hoguet; Milton, H. J. Shaefer; Reading, England & McMakin.

MERRIHEW & THOMPSON, PRINTERS, 7 CARTER'S ALLEY.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. **PHILADELPHIA, JULY, 1848.** **No. 7.**

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY;

OR, THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN IN RELATION TO IMMORTALITY AND ETERNAL LIFE.

BY J. T. WALSH.

No. II.

THE INSTRUMENT OF THOUGHT.

Thought has been ascribed to various organs of the body, by different nations, as well as authors. The Hebrews ascribed *thought* to the "reins" or kidneys; and *feeling* to the heart. Some authors have located the soul in the spine; others in the heart; others in the bowels; and others, again, in the pineal gland. But the researches of Physiologists have long since exploded these vulgar hypotheses, and established the proposition that the *brain is the instrument of thought, feeling, and moral emotion;* and, that the other, *viscera*, are only affected sympathetically.

The simple statement of this proposition is sufficient to convict one of infidelity, in the estimation of the *orthodox* of this age! Talk to them about the brain being the organ of the mind, and they will shrink from you with holy horror, and exclaim, "*infidelity! materialism!!*" For, while they deny that the *brain* is the instrument of thought, they have *brains* enough to know, that the proposition does not favor *immortal-soulism*. And, hence, they deny its truth, not because they can disprove it; but because it is opposed to *their theory* of immortality! And, to sustain this theory, they would sooner deny that man thought by any material instrument, than admit that his *brain* manifested mind!

Such men, though they may possess *brains*, do not properly exercise them. They do not *think* for themselves: they not only "commit the keeping of their souls" to their spiritual leaders; but they, also, "commit the keeping" of their *minds* and *consciences* to them. They *think* not with their *own brains*, but with the *brains* of others—by *proxy!* And, as they do not *think* with *their brains*, perhaps they ought to be excused for denying that, the *brain is the organ of thought!*

There is, however, these *thoughtless thinkers* to the contrary, notwithstanding, an abundance of evidence in proof of our proposition. The brain *is* the instrument of the mind. It is the grand *sensorium* of thought, the fountain of intellect and emotion.

But we shall doubtless be told, that, although the brain may be the instrument of the mind, nevertheless *it is not the mind;* and that, therefore, our argument fails. This objection introduces another question, *What is the mind?* The objector replies, "*The mind is the spirit*, the agent which operates *upon* the brain, developing thought and reason." Thus the mind is defined to be an independent and separate *entity*, possessing all the attributes of intelligence; and manifesting all the phenomena of an intellectual and moral character. According to this view of the subject, all the *human faculties* have their seat in this independent mind or spirit, and merely hold intercourse with external objects, by means of the brain, and its organs. There is, therefore, no intelligence, reason, judgment, or perception apart from this "immaterial spirit," or "soul." Consequently no being, unless possessed of this immortal soul, can manifest mind or intelligence in any degree whatever! A man, then, can think, reason, compare and judge, according to this principle, as well without a brain as with it! And, accordingly it is maintained that *dead men think—that dead men are happy in heaven, or miserable in hell!*

In this "philosophy falsely so called," then, we have the following principles:

1st. That the "immortal soul," spirit, or mind, is the *seat* of all the *human faculties;* and gives rise to all the evil passions, vile motives, and hellish designs of men.

That this is no misrepresentation is evident, because *mind*, according to their theory, is not an attribute of the brain—this being merely its instrument. And these various *mental functions* belong, not to the *instrument* but to the *mind itself.*

Here we have a philosophy, then, which makes *immortality*—"the immortal soul,"—the deep and deadly fountain of every base passion, and every unworthy motive! Well may the advocates of the popular theory talk of "converting the immortal soul;" for, if they are as corrupt as this, they ought to be "converted!"

2. The second principle is, that thought, and all the phenomena of intellectual life, can be manifested independent of the brain, thus rendering the existence of that organ unnecessary in the economy of man. For, surely, that mind which can hold intercourse with all worlds, when out of the body, does not require the intervention of the brain, in this life, in order to hold intercourse with external objects! But, in opposition to this "vain philosophy," we affirm, that the *brain* is as necessary to thought as the eye is to sight, the ear to sound, or the nerves to the sense of feeling. And that it would be just as logical, and just as philosophic to suppose a man could see without the optic nerve, and hear without the auditory apparatus, as it would be to suppose he could think and reason without a brain.

3. A third principle is, that the possession of an "immortal soul" or spirit, *that* being the mind, is essential to the existence and manifestation of the

intellectual faculties. And that, consequently, where there is no "immortal spirit," there is no *mind*.

Upon this hypothesis the "beasts" possess "immortal spirits," for they certainly *think*! What will the advocates of the "*immortal-soul-system*" do with this dilemma? What disposition will they make of this *Bruto-immortal-soul*? Will they take the position of Mr. Wesley, that the beasts will be raised from the dead?

Here they are certainly in a strait; for they must take one or the other of the following positions:

1st. Either that the possession of an "immortal spirit" is *not* necessary to the manifestation of mind: or,

2d. That, if it be, the beasts are "immortal;"

3d. And that they will be raised from the dead: And,

4th. That they are, also, in as much as they are "immortal," *conscious* in death.

We hope the advocates of the popular theory will meet these difficulties, and look them fully in the face. For, we feel confident, that they are here stranded, and must either yield to the omnipotence of truth, or maintain a position utterly subversive of revelation, philosophy, and common sense.

Now we put the emphatic question, "*Is the possession of an immortal-soul essential to thought?* Will the advocates of the popular view take this position? If they do, we repeat it, they will be forced to the conclusion that, *the beasts have immortality*. And, if they possess immortality, what disposition will they make of this brutal soul, when the brute dies? Will it not be conscious? And, if conscious, will it be happy or miserable? Let not our opponents evade these questions, for these are the legitimate consequences of the teaching that an *immortal soul* is essential to the production of mental phenomena. Either answer them, or admit the truth we advocate.

But we are not reduced to this dilemma. We deny, and challenge our opponents to the proof, that an immortal soul or spirit is necessary to thought. The *function* of an organ depends upon its *vital chemical organization*. This gives character to the muscles, the tendons, the ligaments, the nerves, brain, and all the various organs and *viscera* of the body. These organs, thus chemically constituted by that Being who understands every law in his vast universe, being acted on by the positive and negative electro-magnetic forces, develop the peculiar *function* of each organ. It is thus that the muscles contract and expand; the liver secretes bile; the stomach digests food; and that all the various organs perform their respective functions.

Now, we might as well assume that the function of every living tissue depended on an "immortal principle," as to maintain that *immortality* is essential to the manifestation of the functions of the brain and nervous system generally. The grand argument of our opponents is, that *thought is not an attribute, or function of matter*, no matter how organized. This, as we have seen, leads to the conclusion that the beasts possess immortal souls, for they certainly think. We all agree that man thinks, but by what means does he think? Does he think, feel, and reason because he has an immortal soul? Does he not think and reason by means of his brain? Are thought, feeling, and sentiment attributes of immortality *only*? Then it follows that all animals, not possessed of an immortal mind, are incapable of thought, reason, and sentiment; consequently all the lower animals, as well as all idiots, simpletons, or fools, have no immortality about them; because they are incapable of displaying these mental phenomena! This argument, therefore, proves too much for the advocates of the immortal-soul system. It proves that *some men* have no immortality! Here the opposition are certainly in a dilemma, from which no rules of logic on earth can deliver them! While it may be, however, that idiots think, their thoughts and sentiments are not such as we should expect from a mind endowed with the principle of immortality and incorruptibility. Does it not follow, then, if some men, such as idiots, &c., display no trace of incorruptibility, that this principle is not congenital? For, if it were congenital, or hereditary, all men would be in possession of it.

Matter, organized, refined, and endowed with life is capable of thought in the *ratio* of its perfection of organization. That this is true we see demonstrated before our eyes by observing the organization of different genera, species, and varieties in the animal world, from the smallest animalculæ up to man, the noblest work of God. Every link we mark in this great chain of organization, bears upon its face the degree of intelligence it possesses, and establishes the proposition, that intellect, other things being equal, is always in proportion to the perfection of its constitution. Unorganized matter is incapable of thought. Moreover, it is not enough that matter should be organized in order to produce mental phenomena, but it must also be endowed with life, as we have already stated. And to those who deny that organized matter, endowed with life, can think, we will put a few questions. If matter, organized, refined, sublimated, and endowed with life, is incapable of thought, *by what means do the beasts think?* Thought, you affirm, is not a function of matter, and yet *the beasts that perish* THINK! Is thought a function of matter in this case? Again, we would ask, seeing they are all endowed with *instinct*, if this is an attribute or function of matter? Will you affirm that *sight*, *hearing*, *tasting*, *smelling*, and *feeling* are functions of matter, when moulded and fashioned by the hand of God? Is it not preposterous to say that matter can *see*? That matter can *taste*? That matter can *smell*? That matter can *feel*? *And yet you are bound to admit this, or else be driven to the conclusion*, THAT EVERY LIVING THING IN THE UNIVERSE OF GOD HAS AN IMMORTAL SOUL! Are you prepared for this? Or do you shrink back from this position? If so, you must admit that your views of the subject are unsound, and consequently untenable. And if all the functions of the five senses are manifested by matter, why may not *reason*, *perception*, *judgment*, and *imagination* also be developed by matter still more exquisitely organized? If the stomach can digest food, the liver secrete bile, and the heart propel the blood, why may not the brain, acted upon by electro-magnetism, secrete thought? Is there any thing more incompatible in the one case, than in the other? We come, therefore, to this conclusion, that matter, organized as we behold it in man, and endowed with life from God, is capable of manifesting moral and intellectual functions.

We have now shown, that *immortality* is not essential to thought, reason, &c., or that, *if it be*, every living thing, possessing the *five senses*, must be in possession of it: and having made these general remarks, we shall proceed to examine the *mind* and some of its *attributes* in detail. And,

1st OF PERSONAL IDENTITY. A great many singular ideas prevail on the subject of Personal Identity. Those who hold the doctrine of "hereditary immortality," suppose that the soul, or spirit of man constitutes his identity. Supposing then, for the sake of argument, that the soul or spirit, in the popular sense, constitues man's *personal identity*, what is it that speaks when the language "*my* soul," "*my* spirit," "*my* body," or "*my* mind" is used? A man speaks of himself, and says *he* has a mind, a soul, a body, a head and a heart, &c. What is it that possesses all these? Is it not that which is the *representative* of them all? In other words, is it not that which supplies the *I* of consciousness—that which gives rise to the sentiment of personal identity? To affirm the contrary would be to represent the soul or spirit as saying *my* soul, or *my* spirit. Has the soul possession of another soul? Does the spirit possess a spirit? This view of the case, then, is at once reduced to an absurdity. The scriptures do not thus trifle with the understanding of man. It is utterly beneath the dignity of the spirit of wisdom and knowledge thus to speak. Moreover, if the soul constitute the personal identity of man, what becomes of its *immortality* when the feeling of *self-consciousness* is deranged so that the person shall imagine himself to be a very extraordinary personage, a king, an emperor, and even God himself? Can this derangement be affirmed of an immortal soul? Again, as we have organs for the manifestation of all our other feelings and faculties, it is certainly reasonable to suppose that there is an organ, the manifestation of whose function would give rise to the sentiment of I, MYSELF. And when that organ is diseased, its function becomes the subject of that kind of derangement of which we have spoken. While, therefore, it is clear that man has a material organ, whose office it is to create the feeling of personality, or self-consciousness, it is also evident that man is not to be dissected and examined in that state; but that he is to be the subject of a sound, rational, and philosophical analysis, in order to arrive at the truth upon this subject. We would ask one question—if the spirit, mind, or soul, in the popular sense of these words, does everything of a moral and mental nature, by means of material organs, what is left for *the* MAN *to do*? for it is evident that the *spirit* is not the man! These acts, to which we have referred, should be affirmed of *man*, as such, IN THE AGGREGATE, and not of his mind, soul, or spirit. Therefore, when a *man* (not spirit) *sees*, he sees by means of the optic nerve; when *he* hears, it is by means of the ear; when *he* thinks, reasons, reflects and perceives, it is by means of his brain. And as he has organs by which to operate on the world, and by which external objects operate upon him, so it is fair to conclude that every feeling, every moral sentiment, and every intellectual faculty, has its appropriate organ, or instrument, in the brain; and that of personal identity among the number. There is nothing in personal identity, then, to favor the popular view of immortality. Let us now turn our attention,

2d. To THE MEMORY. It is said, man has such powers of mind—such vast intellectual faculties—such a comprehensive judgment, *and such a prodigious memory*, that his mind must be immortal. If this be so, why is it that all men do not possess these noble powers of mind, seeing that they all have immortal souls, if the popular hypothesis be true? Why is it that we have youthful idiots? adult simpletons, and the dotage of the evening of life? Why is it that these incorruptible fires of mind do not kindle, blaze and burn with equal brightness in youth, manhood, and old age, seeing the same immortal genius-inspiring agent breathes its life-giving spirit upon the strings of the exquisitely tuned instrument, at each of these stages alike? If the mind be essentially immortal, why are its fortunes through life so variant? Ah! the answer is, that the instrument is imperfect in childhood, and out of order in old age. So it appears that every thing depends upon the perfection of the instrument at last, and thus the immortal mind, as our opponents will have it, is cast into the shade, and is made only of secondary importance in the manifestation of intellect! But more of this, when we come to speak of *mental diseases*. We grant that the memory of a cultivated mind is very comprehensive, but, alas! how little is remembered of one's history and of the history of the world! The mind of man is exceedingly treacherous. The most important facts, the most startling truths, and the most overwhelming considerations are soon forgotten, vanished like the baseless fabric of a vision, leaving not a wreck behind! Reason declares that FORGETFULNESS is not an attribute of an incorruptible mind or memory. An incorruptible mind must have an incorruptible memory. The impressions made upon a mind that is mortal or corruptible, will be like those made upon the sand, while those made upon an immortal mind, will be like those engraved upon the solid marble, and will never be effaced. The Angels are not forgetful. There is no forgetfulness in Heaven—this is an attribute of "dull mortality," and not of incorruptibility! Impressions made upon an immortal mind, are stereotyped by Jehovah, and will remain indelible through the eternal ages! Memory, then, affords no proof of man's immortality here, but the reverse. So long as impressions fade from the tablet of his mind, just so long will that mind prove itself corruptible. Besides, it is a remarkable fact, that the memory is more treacherous upon some subjects than upon others. This is incompatible with the notion that memory is an attribute of an incorruptible principle in man; for, in that event, every fact and circumstance would be retained alike.

In concluding this article, we will add a few words on the *Love of Life*, which, as Plato is made to say, causes "the soul to shrink back on herself, and startle at the *idea* of destruction." In that popular soliloquy to which we have alluded, we have the following: "It must be so, Plato, thou reasonest well." "It must be" what? Why the soul "must be" immortal. But why "must it be" immortal? Here is the answer—"Else whence this *fond desire*, this PLEASING HOPE, *this* LONGING AFTER IMMORTALITY?" "Plato, thou *reasonest* well!" Because man has a "*fond desire*," a "pleasing hope," and a "*longing after immortality*," therefore, *he is immortal!* Because a man "*desires*," "hopes," and "longs" for a thing, therefore *he has* that thing!! Truly, "Plato, thou reasonest well!!" And, then again, if the soul be not immortal, why should "she shrink back on herself," at the approach of death, "and startle at" the very idea of "destruction?" The Platonic answer is, "'tis the *divinity* that stirs within us." The "divinity shrinks back on itself, and startles at destruction!" Cogent reasoning! Profound logic! But although the soul has such a horror of death and destruction, yet, "secure in herself,

she *smiles* at the drawn dagger, and *defies* it's point?" And, though the moon and stars may fade from the heavens, "and the sun himself grow dim," the soul shall flourish in immortal youth, unhurt amid "the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds!" This is pure Platonism, as well as the essence of *modern* Christianity. But we shall reverse Plato's reasoning, although it is said he "reasoned well." The very truth, that there is in man a "fond desire," a "pleasing hope," and "a longing after immortality," is good evidence that *he is not* in possession of it. Why should a man desire, hope, and long for an object already in his possession? There is an *innate dread* of "shrinking into nought," and a longing after life implanted in every man; and no person, unless deranged, will commit suicide. A poet, whose name I have never known, has given a very different description of the soul's exit from the one indicated in the above allusions. Speaking of a death scene, he says: "At that dread moment the soul *raves* round the walls of her clay tenement; runs to each avenue and shrieks for help, but shrieks in vain! Her very eyes weep blood, and every sigh is big with horror." Here we have the monstrous doctrine of an *immortal soul raving round the walls of her clay tenement*, running to each avenue and shrieking for help, but shrieking in vain? This immortal soul, too, can *weep tears of blood*, and utter sighs big with the horror of prospective damnation! And yet, this is the "divinity" that stirs within us, smiles at the drawn dagger, and defies its point! What a libel upon the truth of God!

But let us turn from the contemplation of this damnable heresy, to the glorious truths of the Apostolic proclamation. And let the reader remember, that God will only render eternal life to those, who, by a patient continuance in well doing, SEEK FOR GLORY, HONOR, AND INCORRUPTIBILITY.

In our next article, we shall take up the subject of *mental diseases*.

[For Bible Examiner.]

DR. THOMAS' REJOINDER TO BR. GREW.

"LOVE," OR "CHARITY."

Having been requested to make some remarks on "*H. Grew's Response*" in No. 5, p. 68, I proceed to observe that friend Grew attributes to me inferentially "an opinion" which I do not entertain, namely, that *men dying in impenitence will in some cases be forgiven*. On the contrary, I believe, that men dying in impenitence will *in no case*, and under no circumstances be forgiven. I believe further, that no man's sins will be forgiven, however "pious" he may be, or however "sorry" he may be, if, before he die, he has not believed and obeyed the Gospel of the Kingdom in the name of Jesus, and walked worthy of the high vocation to which he has been called. It is no business of mine to build up a wall of casuistry around this impregnable position, by which to mask its formidable appearance. This frowning fortress of the truth may dismay the timid heart of ignorance and unbelief, and cause it to apostrophize the air with lack-a-daisy exclamations about "love" and "charity"! This is no affair of mine. The truth belongs to God, not to me; and godlike love and charity consists in plain, unvarnished exhibitions of that truth in such unmistakable and intelligible terms, that men may be able to comprehend it, and be saved by it. It is a godlike charity to pluck men like brands from the burning, though you rescue them by violence; it is the cheat of hypocrisy and infidelity—it is to put the poisoned chalice of deceit to their lips, to soften down the asperity and sternness of the truth lest it should hurt the feelings or morbid sensitiveness of the "carnal mind," which is "enmity against God," and rebellion against his law. I have no sympathy with that sort of "love" which leaves men to die in error,, which "knowledge" teaches is damnable. John Wesley is no authority with me. He was doubtless a very pious, a very sincere errorist. His system proves him to have been ignorant, and therefore, faithless of the Gospel of the Kingdom; so that his opinion of how many truths we may die in ignorance of, and be saved, weighs not a feather, in my estimation, however potent it may be with others. Knowledge will avail us nothing without *that* "love" of which Paul speaks; but then, that charity, or love, "rejoiceth in *the truth; believeth* ALL *things;* and HOPETH *all things*:" hence, much as "charity" or "love" are *on the lips* of men, he who is ignorant of the truth, believeth not and hopeth not in all things of that truth, is utterly destitute of the true love and charity so highly extolled by the Apostle. Men mistake a *natural* amiability of disposition, decorated after a certain fashion with sectarian piety, for love, for charity, for godliness! But this is a mere substitute for scriptural love, a maudlin, spurious affair. Gospel love is the fulfilling of the law in the faith and disposition of Abraham, the father of the faithful and the friend of God. No, no; he that believeth THE GOSPEL, and is baptized, shall be saved; there is no evading this: "charity," "piety," "penitence," without this, are but the righteousness of filthy rags.

MEN DYING IMPENITENT, NEVER FORGIVEN.

The proposition then before us is, that *men dying faithless or impenitent, or both, will never be forgiven*. This we believe the scriptures teach. But what has that to do with *men of faith, dying in sins "not unto death?"* Paul saith, "WE must all appear at the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive *the things in body*, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad." The "we" referred to in this text, are not all mankind, but all of *a class*, and that class the aggregate of believers. Now, by way of illustration, let us suppose a case.

One of the Corinthian disciples committed a great crime. Paul, though absent, judged his case from the report laid before him. He commanded the Elders to put in force the sentence he pronounced in the name of the Lord, to wit, that they should *deliver the criminal to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, and keep no company with him, nor even eat with him*. This sentence they executed and persisted in, until they heard from the apostle again. After a certain time had elapsed he wrote, and sent the offender a pardon; and because the punishment had brought him to a deep conviction of the enormity of his sin, and a sincere contrition for it. This was the object of the chastisement, namely, that when the offender shall appear at the judgment seat of Christ in the day of the Lord Jesus, "the spirit may be saved." To this person it might be said, "in being thus judged, you are chastened of the Lord, that you should not be condemned with the world." If the chastisement had failed to bring him to such a state of mind as the Lord will acknowledge, in the Future Age he would be condemned with the world. But seeing the happy effect pro-

duced, the apostle wrote, saying, "sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which is of the many;" forgive him, therefore, and comfort him, lest perhaps he be swallowed up of overmuch sorrow: their forgiveness the apostle recognizes as his, and his own as forgiveness from the Lord; *therefore, when he appears in the day of Christ he will no more be called to account for this sin.* This is one view of the case before us; let us now look at the other side.

A disciple in the 19th century, as really a disciple in faith as the Corinthian, commits, we suppose, precisely the same offence. A committee of brethren adjudge him to Satan *for the destruction of the flesh.* They have pronounced their sentence; they no more keep company with him, nor eat with him—turn him out of the Body of Christ they cannot do; this is beyond their ability, no matter how many thunders of excommunication they may hurl against him—but still *Satan does not destroy his flesh*; and, if he were to become "weak and sickly"—1 Cor. 11: 30—and this painful wasting of his flesh were to bring him to the same penitence as his Corinthian parallel, the committee not having the power of healing and forgiving sins, he might "fall asleep" in utter despair, and Satan get the advantage. Now the offender before us would die unforgiven in this age; the question therefore is, *would he be forgiven in the next or Future Age?* And as then "we" are to receive in body according to what we have done;" and seeing that our modern disciple did not receive in body according to his deed as the Corinthian did, we ask further, will he not in the Future Age receive in like manner for his crime, and afterwards be forgiven, but have no part in the honour and glory of the Kingdom, though he may without dying again live for ever, a saved man upon earth, after the Kingdom is delivered up to the Father? This we think is the scope of the word; but that there are some offences, commissible by believers, which "are unto death," and for which there is no forgiveness in this world, nor in the age to come. For sins unto death, committed by believers, it is no use asking or expecting forgiveness; for it will not be granted; of this class are "speaking against the Holy Spirit," and murder, and "treading under foot the blood of the Son of God," &c. But, John says, there are sins not unto death; for these there is forgiveness for the faithful, *with chastisement according to the offence*, in the age to come. Hence, the necessity of a Future Age to afford scope as to time, place and circumstances, for a recompense appropriate to the viciousness as well as the virtues of those upon whom the name of Christ is named. There is much to be said upon this topic which cannot be said now. The reader must follow out the train of thought suggested for himself.

NON-RESURRECTION OF MILLIONS.

Friend Grew asks, *where do the scriptures teach the* ***non-resurrection*** *of millions?* This question can be answered in the twinkling of an eye. When "the Lord shall spread forth his hands in the midst of Israel, as he that swimmeth spreadeth forth his hands to swim, * * * in that day shall this song be sung in the Land of Judah." Now in this song the Israelites sing, "O Lord our God, lords beside thee have had dominion over us: by thee only will we make mention of thy name. They are *dead*, they SHALL NOT LIVE; *they are deceased*, THEY SHALL NOT RISE: therefore hast thou visited and DESTROYED them, and made all their memory to perish. Isa. 25: 11; 26: 13, 14; From this we learn the non-resurrection of millions of lords, who have tyrannized over Israel—Egyptians, Philistines, Midianites, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Medo-Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Russians, Turks, &c., &c. The text is so striking and emphatic, that no sane man can misunderstand it. Those who are not to live nor rise again once lived; for it styles them "dead" and "deceased," which are only affirmed of the once living. It also teaches us the meaning of "*destroyed*," to wit, *that which shall not live by a resurrection unto life*—this is to perish. But, as to the faithful, it says, "thy Dead shall live, as my Dead Body shall they arise;" therefore. "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew (O Sun of Righteousness) is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the (Lord's) dead.—*Verse* 19.

The foregoing is quite in harmony with "the literal import of John 5: 28." The "all" in this verse is defined in the next. ALL *who?* "They that have done good" and "they that have done evil." But, this does not include all mankind; for there are multitudes who come into and go out of the world, that do neither good nor evil. "Just" and "unjust" are terms of relation, not absolutes; and are predicable only of those who live under times of knowledge. Sinners are just or unjust relatively to the Gospel of the Kingdom; absolutely, they are "sinners," and "the wicked." It no where teaches in the word that all "sinners" and "all the wicked" shall be raised from the dead; yet it doth teach the resurrection of the just and unjust. "Every man according to his deeds," "every soul of man that doeth evil," and "every man that worketh good," are all phrases of relation, and embraced in the "WE" who are to appear before the judgment seat of Christ *as limited by the subject* of which the apostle treats. He is not speaking about *all mankind*, but of Jews whom he apostrophizes from *Rom.* 2: 1—29. As to the Gentiles who had "sinned without law," they perish; while those, both Jews and Gentiles, who are under law, *shall be judged by the law* in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to Paul's gospel." How would friend Grew judge Cossacks, Hottentots, Caffres, Hindoos, Chinese, &c., by Paul's gospel, or Moses' law, who had never heard of the one or the other? To declare them just or unjust by these, would be as reasonable and fit as to justify or condemn the Irish sedition-mongers by the law of the United States. Cannot the reader see that a Russian is neither just nor unjust, innocent nor guilty, virtuous nor vicious, whatever may be his absolute or real character, according to the law of England or these States? And why? Because there is no relation subsisting between him and these constitutions. He is not under law to Britain, therefore he will perish without that law speaking for or against him. "Where no law is, there is no transgression;" and "without faith it is impossible to please God." These two principles decide the fate of millions. "Where there is no vision the people perish."

That little monosyllable "*all*," or its ghost, so haunts the lucubrations of our venerable and respected friend, that he sees it dancing before his eyes like a will-o-the-wisp, on whichever side he turns his vision. He quotes Heb. 9: 27, and there he thrusts it in as if the apostle had really placed it there! "It is appointed *unto* ALL *men* once to die, but after this the judgment." Paul does not say so;

he says, "it is appointed *unto men* once to die," &c. If he had said what Mr. Grew makes him testify, he would contradict himself; for in another place he saith, "We shall not all sleep," or die, "but we shall *all* be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last (seventh) trumpet; for the trumpet shall sound, and the righteous dead shall be raised incorruptible, and *we* (all) shall be changed." But, we will not press our friend too hard in this place, for he makes an admission immediately after which concedes to us all we demand. "*If, indeed,*" saith he, "*we have any plain, positive declarations that some of the human family will never be raised from the dead, we must understand these universal terms in a limited sense, but not otherwise.*" "Will the Doctor favour us with the chapter and verse?" Yes; this we have already done.

FAITH IN PROPHETIC TRUTHS NECESSARY.

Mr. Grew doth not like my position, that "a man cannot be saved in any sense, unless he also believe the *prophetic truths* concerning the Kingdom of God." Now the subject matter of these truths is the Kingdom, and the Kingdom is the subject of the Gospel. No KINGDOM, no GOSPEL. My proposition, therefore, is convertible into this: that *no man can be saved without faith in the Kingdom.* Mr. G. in disputing my position, necessarily affirms the contrary; I call upon him, therefore, as he calls upon me elsewhere, to adduce "chapter and verse" in proof that man or woman, infant or suckling, can be saved in any sense without faith in the prophetic Kingdom.

"TO THE LAW AND THE TESTIMONY, IF THEY SPEAK NOT ACCORDING TO THIS WORD, IT IS BECAUSE THERE IS NO LIGHT IN THEM." It will save time and space to adhere to this exclusively, and not to introduce the Johns of any sect. They are of no value in any question at issue between the searchers after truth in this century. They belong to the darkness of times bygone.

REPENTANCE, IMMERSION, AND HOLINESS, INDIVISIBLE.

"A correct belief of doctrine and facts" is a belief of the truth; an incorrect belief of doctrine and facts is a belief of error. Mr. G. places himself in opposition to the principle, that a belief of the truth with repentance, immersion and holiness, are indivisibly essential to salvation in the Kingdom of God, and affirms, that "we have scriptural truth and fact to the contrary." Now we invite the reader's attention to this, namely, that Mr. Grew cannot adduce a single case from the New Testament of Jew or Gentile being recognized as a Christian after the day of Pentecost (see Acts 2,) who did not believe the Gospel of the Kingdom as promised *in the word*—the things concerning Jesus—whose repentance was not evinced by turning from a justification by law to that of Christ; and who was not immersed. He has doubtless selected the strongest evidence he could find. Hence he sends us to 1 Cor. 8: 11. But this is no case in point. The individual was already in a saved state, and he was put into that state as the rest of his brethren in Corinth were, namely, by "hearing, believing and being baptized." What did they hear? Luke says they heard "THE WORD." What is the Word? "The Law and the *Testimony*," both of prophets and apostles. Hence Paul reminds them that he preached the Gospel to them, which he styles *tis logos*, A CERTAIN WORD, "by which ye are saved IF *ye keep it in memory.*" But the man referred to had been long a pagan worshipper. The word preached laid hold of him with such power, that the least approximation to idolatrous observances on the part of any brother, defiled or wounded his sensitive conscience exceedingly. This was a laudable Christian weakness on the right side. He had still what Paul terms "the conscience of the idol," but not an idolatrous conscience. The meat offered to an idol always reminded him of the worship connected with it; and that as an idolator, the eating of such meat was esteemed by him a part of the idol worship. Now, although he knew an idol was nothing, and that all meats were eatable by Christians, save blood and things strangled, yet he could not get rid of the original impressions; so that when he saw a brother eating such meat, the eating would force itself upon his conscience as idolatry, while the eater ate of it with contempt for the idol. The apostle commands the latter to forbear eating, lest it might become an occasion of stumbling to the brother of tender conscience. His "views of the unity of God and of idols were" not "incorrect." "We all have knowledge" on these things, says Paul. It was, as shown, the accuracy of his knowledge which made him so unhappy when he saw brethren too much at home in idol temples and festivals.

NOT WEAK IN FAITH.

We need not repeat here what we have said before about *weak in faith*, and *weak in the faith*. He of Rom. 14: 1, was not weak in faith. He was not "erroneous or ignorant in respect to" the word of the truth of the gospel. He was "in the faith," which he could only be by believing the Gospel and being baptized; but he was "weak," or sensitively consciencious, as to eating all things indiscriminately. If he were a Jew, he still had *the conscience of the law;* or, if a Gentile, he still had *the conscience of the idol*, in relation to meats and herbs. He was not weak in faith, but strong; for it is not persons of weak faith that brave death in turning from Judaism to Christ, or from dumb idols to serve the living and true God.

BORN OF WATER.

Mr. Grew says: "In the various passages, which state particularly the characters which have no inheritance in the Kingdom of God, the *unimmersed* are never mentioned." Does Mr. Grew regard Jesus as authority in the case? He says, "except a man be BORN OF WATER and of spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. Some one may possibly be rash enough to say, that to be "born of water" is not baptism! Does water mean water here? Some say yes, some no! According to these, *water* means *spirit*, which makes nonsense of the passage; "except a man be born of spirit and of spirit" is a perfect *reductio ad absurdum*. Such critics are either above reason or below it; and as we claim to be reasonable, we leave them to their vain imaginings. Some have sense enough to admit, that *water*, in this text, means that compound of oxygen and hydrogen upon which Noah's Ark floated. With these, then, we talk. The metaphor connected with water is *a being born*. What does being born of any thing consist in? Is it not an emergence from a place in which the subject was previously out of sight? Admitted. If then earth be the matrix of which a thing is born, would

not a being born of earth, consist in coming up out of the ground in which the subject had been previously concealed? And doth the substitution of water for earth make any difference in the idea of birth? To be born of water, then, is also to come up out of water in which the person had been *deposited*, for there can be no *e*mergence without previous *im*mersion. No man who hath any regard for his intellect, will venture to say, that baptism is not a birth of water, and a birth of water, baptism. Jesus then saith, that except a man believe the gospel, which is to be begotten of the spirit; and be baptized, or born of water, he cannot be saved, or enter the Kingdom of God. As to "the characters," Mr. G. refers to, the apostle addresses himself to immersed believers, and therefore it would have been superfluous to have told them "the unimmersed should not enter the Kingdom." He had told them that *before they became Christians*, as we have shown; it was unnecessary to repeat then what nobody in that age, Jew or Pagan, ever dreamed of omitting to do.

Immersion is not "*the duty*," but *a gracious privilege* granted to every believer of the things of the Kingdom of God, and the name of the Lord Jesus. Immersion submitted to as a mere duty, is worth nothing. It is a privilege to which no one is intitled who is not a true believer; that is, an Abrahamic believer of the Truth. It is the last thing that ought to be preached; and thousands are preached into the water that are utterly and astoundingly ignorant of "the word of the truth of the gospel." The one thing needful to this generation is faith, without which immersion is a mere form of godliness, devoid of all efficacy and power.

"It is an undeniable fact," says Mr. Grew, "that there are many real Christians who are unimmersed," &c. No doubt the unimmersed will be highly delighted with Mr. Grew's "charity," and proportionally indignant at the man who has hardihood enough to deny Mr. Grew's "undeniable fact." An "unimmersed Christian" in New Testament times, was a phenomenon as extraordinary as a white crow, or a black swan! I have never discovered one yet among all the cases on record in the Scriptures since Pentecost. I have heard of multitudes of such Christians in the dominion of Rome; but I have never yet seen one in the Body of Christ; nor do I expect to see such a one in the Kingdom of God, if the words of Jesus were spoken in the soberness and simplicity of truth.

NECESSITY AND USE OF KNOWLEDGE.

"The eyes of your understanding being enlightened in the hope of the calling, and the riches of the glory of the Inheritance in the Saints," *is one thing*; and to "discern accurately all things which all the prophets have foretold concerning the Kingdom of God, and the true periods of their fulfilment," *is another thing!*

I am very far from saying, that such a discernment is necessary to entitle a man to entrance into the Kingdom of God; but I do say, that illumination in the one thing is essential, not as a mere matter of knowledge, but that this knowledge may effect a renewal unto life through a participation in the divine nature. "Grace and peace be multiplied to you *through the knowledge* of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ, according as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain to life and godliness, *through the knowledge* of Him that hath called us to glory and virtue: whereby are given to us *exceeding great and precious promises:* that BY THESE ye might be *partakers of the* DIVINE NATURE." This is the necessity and use of knowledge, without which we are the sport of every wind of doctrine, and vain conceit, and assimilate to the demon of ignorance and superstition, and become an easy prey to the things which are earthly, sensual and devilish. Without supposing that "*I only am left*," I am deeply penetrated with the conviction, that of this generation, they are few who will find eternal life.

THE UNIMMERSED AND FEARFUL EXCLUDED THE KINGDOM.

"The unimmersed," says Mr. Grew, "are not excluded from the Kingdom of God." Wonder if Mr. Grew believes, that *the fearful* are excluded? Why doth our venerable friend turn special pleader for the unimmersed, and not extend his labour of "love" and "charity" to the timid? There is a vastly greater number in jeopardy of damnation from their cowardice, than from their non-immersedness. A man may have a correct theory, be duly dipped, and very "pious," but fearful withal; one, of whom it cannot be said, in spirit or fact, that "he overcame by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of his testimony; and loved not his life unto the death." Such an one may deceive himself, but he cannot impose upon God: unless God repeal his law, it is impossible he can be saved. Let then, our venerable friend, beware! An advocate may be "fearful," while he is the apologist for error, ignorance, and disobedience. The Apostle Peter says: "Repent and *be baptised*, EVERY ONE OF YOU, in the name of Jesus Christ;" it is not absolutely necessary, says Mr. Grew, for "the unimmersed are not excluded from the holy kingdom of God." Hence, instead of "every one" doing the command, some conform, and others do not. Such is the effect of Mr. Grew's teaching. Well, if he effect an entrance for himself, let him bear in mind the word, that "whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them the same, shall be called great; for I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of God."

JOHN THOMAS

Richmond, Va., May 15, A. M. 5934.

"It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing."—Gal. 4: 18.

RELIGIOUS ZEAL.—"Zeal, says a celebrated writer, 'is a passionate ardour for any person or cause. There are various kinds of zeal; as, 1, An ignorant zeal, as in Romans 10: 2, 3, where some are said to have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. 2. A persecuting zeal, as in Philippians 3: 6, where Paul recounted his former earnest endeavours to destroy the Church of Christ. There is also a superstitious zeal, a hyprocritical zeal, a party zeal, &c. But the zeal which the Lord approves is a genuine zeal in a good cause. Such a zeal as seeks for the Glory of

God and the good of man. It is founded in knowledge, faith and perseverance, and will manifest itself in love and constancy toward a good cause, and generally results in final success. Such is the certain result where pure religion is the object it seeks to promote, and wisdom and knowledge its attendant guides."—*Selected.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JULY, 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Bible.

TRUTH SEEKERS.

We have no sympathy for that spirit which, having attained a certain point in theology, or any other investigation, requires that all who are recognized as brethren, or fellow-laborers, should refrain from further investigations, or from a calm and fearless expression of the result of their labors in search after truth. All new sects have commenced with professions of liberality and denouncing the illiberality of others for not allowing them to express, among them, new truths, or new light upon old truths, which they believe they have discovered. They avow their determination never to organize a sect; and sometimes declare—"If *we* ever become a sect we shall be the *youngest daughter* of the old MOTHER OF HARLOTS." A few years pass away and the leaders in these movements find persons among them that think they have discovered further light on important subjects, and who *dare* to give utterance to the convictions of their own free thoughts. Then those, who professed they never would be a sect, find it necessary to take counsel together, and, lest they should be suspected of being tinctured with the heresy, they must make a formal declaration of principles; "not a *Creed*," to be sure; that would be too bare-faced an act for the "youngest daughter" just yet; but, some standard principles, by which, gradually, they can, under the pretence of *harmony*, persuade most, who have been tinctured with the views they wish to suppress, to fall back on the "*important* point" of their theory, and give up the free expression of other things, even "if they are truth," well knowing if they can only persuade men to "put their light under a bushel" it will go out; or, which is the same thing, it will give light to no one, and so prove harmless. When all things are thus well arranged, then all that do not come into this organization are "*disorganizers*;" and anything else that will tend to destroy their influence may be said of them; and, in all that, be doing "God service." Then they, the "youngest daughter," must take good care to let it be known that they occupy the true apostolic ground, and are persecuted with the approbious name "Pope," and as having gone into "Popery." The sect, now, have only to pass resolutions expressing the fullest confidence in every thing their Leaders have done and are doing, and the work is complete—the sect is organized; but they don't "know it" themselves, and are not likely ever to see it; or if they do, it will not do to own it—for the leaders must never "*confess*;" if they do they will be suspected of lacking "*infallibility*."

It is the *intention* of the conductors of the Bible Examiner to strive to avoid such a shipwreck; and to exclude no theological subject from their columns merely because it is new, unpopular, or in opposition to their own views or the views of a portion of their patrons. We intend to make the Examiner a medium of thought for all who deal in *argument*, soberly expressed; and who do not employ *personalities*. All writers for the Examiner will be responsible for the sentiments they express, and *they only*. The editors are not to be understood as assuming it, merely because they give place to the article. We choose to give our readers a chance to judge for themselves, without having an editorial *veto* on every thing that differs from their present views. Our object is to elicit *Truth*. How is that to be done if no doubt must ever be permitted to arise as to any point we now hold as truth? That is *the sin* of all the sects: not that they have no truth, but they are determined that no new truth, or light, shall be elicited that might conflict with their stereotyped declaration of principles, or creeds.

We cannot better express our object and aim than in the language of the Editor of "THE TRUTH SEEKER AND CHRISTIAN THINKER," published in Leeds, England, by DR. FREDERICK R. LEES, F. S. A. He says:—

1. "By 'TRUTH-SEEKER,' we do not signify that no truth is *found*, nor have we reference to *our own* opinions exclusively. The title is rather intended to express the character of the Work, as an *organ* for the discussion and discovery of Truth, than the position of any individual writer. In the spirit of the Jewish sage, we exhort all men, everywhere, to 'get wisdom,' and 'get understanding;' not implying thereby that they are destitute of all wisdom and intelligence, but that wisdom is a fountain, and knowledge a stream, of which all men may drink forever—living and inexhaustable waters flowing from the throne of God—upspringing from the INFINITE DEPTHS of His everlasting being. In the words of the same inspired thoughtsman, we say—'Buy the truth and sell it not;'—not meaning by these words that we have *no* truth now, or that in a coming day we shall have acquired *all* truth, and then cease to be truth-seekers; but, on the contrary, we mean to affirm, that of all commerce, that in wisdom is the richest and noblest; that 'Truth' is a treasure more precious than fine gold, 'a pearl beyond price'—an *infinite treasure*, the

splendor and beauties of which it is the sphere of the *infinite ages* to unfold to the growing and progressing faculties of man. It must be purchased by toil and thought, and, even then, it will not be revealed, save to its sincere worshippers; it is a sacred treasure forever hidden to the gaze of purblind prejudice.

2. "Truth, we contend, must be to every man *subjective*—that which to each seems best to express the Facts of Nature and the Truths of God. Whatever may be *the sense*, *the impression*, left on any individual soul, by unbiased contact with the word or the works of God—THAT must be *his* truth. calling for sacred reverence as the revelation of God to him, and for constant or consistent obedience. If party, or passion, or power, or pelf, or fear, or favor, shall urge him to let it go, see that he do it not! Rather, bind it fast round his heart of hearts; it has been bought of God, and is a sacred deposit. '*Sell it not.*'

3. "The *impression* on our God-made intellect is the result of God-made Laws: it is the most sacred law and the highest rule of life. Hence, *the great duty of every man to prepare himself conscientiously for the calm reception of that truth by which he must live.* This is the primal duty—but how despised! Let us learn, then, to seek God and Truth—let our spirits lie in reverential silence before Him, so that, no disturbing passion or prejudice intervening to refract the rays of truth, we may receive the right impression. Let the soul be daguerreotyped in the sun light of the Eternal. Thus, and thus only, can we worthily worship the Highest in the highest way —'in spirit and in truth.'

4. "With such opinions we necessarily discard all *one-sided views* of truth, and insist on each writer standing on his own responsibility. We shall afford to truth-seekers, therefore, a fitting medium for tolerant exposition and unshackled enquiry, apart from all sect or party. The claim of *infallibility*, by Pope or Protestant, we utterly despise. We stand or fall by these principles—*that the duty of truth seeking is paramount to all others*—that it is a crime against God and against man to hold out hope or fear, reward or loss, with the view of determing the judgment of men on this side or on that—that it is a vice of the worst kind, leading to spiritual death, to give up the use of your own talent, the exercise of your own reason, to priest or sect—that truth is *subjective* to every one, and, therefore, that it is the duty of every individual, to put by all who dare presumptuously to step in between the soul and God, and solemnly to determine for himself, according to the value and weight of the evidence before him, *what is Truth* and what is Error. The Reformed Churches have hitherto equally denied these great principles—they have overlooked the fact, that hope and fear are no instruments of discovery. The only difference is this—that once Rome had a *monopoly* of infallibility and swayed the sceptre of spiritual despotism over willing slaves and undivided empire, whereas Protestanism is a *competition* of infallibilities, exhibiting the partial union of sects in conjunction with universal warfare. It is mere fiction to call the Reformed Churches a Republic, as contra-distinguished from the mighty monarchy of the Church of Rome. A Republic involes *equality of claim*, and negatives all separate, distinct ascendancy. But is it so among the sects? Nearly all claim 'divine right'—not merely to *judge for themselves*, but for others; each speaks of the rest, not as citizen of citizen, but as *prince* speaks of *pretender*. Accordingly, each sect aspires to be Pope—mimics the spiritual policy of the triple-crown, and echoes with its tin trumpets the thunder-voice of the vatican! But it shall not be so amongst 'truth-seekers:' they shall unite in bringing about a wiser and worthier reformation, in enforcing the *morality of enquiry*, and of achieving the downfall of *sectarian intolerance*. To this grand object we shall devote our work and consecrate our powers. This Reformation will discard the angry intolerance with which men look upon doubt, and consecrate it as a mental state necessary and natural in passing from a lower to a higher point of intellectual progress. It will affix to all *wilful favoritism* in the treatment of evidence, a sentiment of stern disapprobation, and direct the feeling of *moral responsibility* towards keeping the process of enquiry perfectly free from partiality or bias. *Really believing* in the truth, and that true religion is indeed reasonable—'the LOGOS, or *reason* of God, which, in the beginning, was with God'—men will cease to hoodwink the faculty within them, and fearlessly look truth in the face! He who does not will be branded as coward and criminal—traitor to truth, infidel to faith."

Such sentiments we ardently hope may animate us in our work. We beg our readers to ponder well the extract we have given them; especially the paragraphs 2 and 4. We heard the sound of such a Periodical as the "Truth Seeker" last winter for the first time, and gave our readers an able article, second handed, from that paper in our January and February numbers. We knew not where in England it was published; but we ventured to send two numbers of the Examiner, directed to London, soliciting an exchange. A few days since we received the following letter from Dr. "F. R. Lees," dated

"LEEDS, (*England,*) May 20th, 1848.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have this week received, in my London parcel, two copies of the BIBLE EXAMINER, (viz. the numbers for *March and April,*) and shall be glad to *exchange* with you. * * * I rejoice to see an organ devoted, like my own, to *free* and *fearless* discussion, confident as I am, that TRUTH *must* prevail; and especially glad to see you so ably demolishing the pernicious absurdity of the natural-immortality-dogma. You will find articles on *that* subject occasionally in the TRUTH-SEEKER. Please direct to me here, and send me the back numbers, as I should like my set to be complete.

"Wishing you success in your efforts at a Reform of Thought, and every blessing in Christ Jesus our Lord,

I remain,
Yours, truly,
F. R. LEES."

DR. LEES may be assured his expression of sympathy for us is like "cold water to a thirsty soul." We hope soon to be further enabled to enrich our paper not only by extracts from the Truth Seeker, but by the writings of able men in England, direct for the Examiner.

Now, friends of the Examiner, shall we be sus-

tained in continuing and enlarging this paper? We feel very little doubt we shall be able to accomplish the present volume without any other pecuniary loss than that of our time; though, as yet, we have not funds to complete the year. Shall we continue and enlarge the paper? Let us hear from all our friends soon on this subject. The field of thought and matter widens before us. Shall we have a paper that has *room* for it?

"NOBILITY OF THE SOUL."—A preacher, not long since, in expatiating upon the "nobility of the soul," said: "*It is the Essence of Deity.*" And he concluded he had "demolished [annihilated!] Geo. Storrs!" No wonder he should think so; for instead of a *trinity* Deity, his Deity's "name is *Legion*,"—yea, "*Legions*;" and as he has thus, to the extent of his power, demolished "the Lord our God," who "is *one Lord*," it was an easy matter to demolish so small a fragment of him as "George Storrs."

But seriously. The immortal-soulists are hard pressed when they are so manifestly driven back on Paganism to maintain life. Let us see what this theory comes to. First.—If the soul is the essence of Deity, then God is not *one* and indivisible; but a *multitude*. Second.—On that theory, either there is no such thing as sin, or a part of God sins; if a part of God sins, then some parts of him are opposed to other parts of him, and thus God is divided against himself; "How, then, shall his kingdom stand?" Third.—As the soul is sometimes unhappy, it follows, on that theory, that a part of God is sometimes unhappy; and if the "endless misery" doctrine be true, then many parts of God will be endlessly miserable. That is not all: as those in endless torment are represented, by the immortal-soul theorists, as eternally cursing God and blaspheming his name, then many parts of the "essence of Deity" will be eternally cursing the other parts of the "essence of Deity!!" unless those theorists can make out, some how, that these immortal souls get so wicked that they cease to be of the "essence of the Deity!" But if so, a part of the Deity is annihilated; or, which is the same thing, a part of the essence of Deity is converted into that which is not a part of himself; and so when God swore by himself as "*I live*," his oath is not to be depended on, because a large part of his "essence" is *not to live as* his "essence."

The preachers who undertake to show the "nobility of the soul," and maintain that it is a part of God, had better remember that our first parents, in seeking to "*be as Gods*," fell into corruption and death; and there, without repentance, all their posterity will fall, and "perish forever," the "essence of Deity" though they may think themselves, and say like their father of old,—"I will be as God." This pride of heart will bring them down to the dust of death, and they "*shall be no more*." Please read 28th chapter of Ezekiel, to the 19th verse.

MORE FANCY SKETCHES.—We have concluded to devote a corner of the Examiner as a refuge for immortal-soulists; where the sayings peculiar to that theory, shall have a resting place. One of our *Exchanges* gives an account of three deaths in one city. Concerning the first, the correspondent says:

"His removal was felt to be a great loss to the Church; but we would not recall him from the glorious sphere of being and action, to which he has gone."

The Bible declares "there is *no work, nor knowledge* in *sheol* whither" men "*go*" when they die, see Eccl. 9: 12. The next account, or the second death spoken, is that of a sister. The writer says: "She appeared to enjoy perfect victory over death."

Paul supposed the victory over death would be at the *resurrection;* Cor. 15: 53, 54. But immortal-soulists make the victory over death at the time death conquers. A certain General in Mexico claimed the victory when he was sadly defeated. The soldier and the immortal-soulists are alike—they conquer, but it is by defeat! But the climax is to come; the third death was that of another sister; and of the three together, the writer says:

"*Consumption* was the AGENT of the KING OF TERRORS, employed in each case to sever life's tender ties, to send the body back to dust, and to TRANSLATE THE SOUL TO ITS ETERNAL BLISS." He adds: "It (consumption) is an insidious deception, and *mortal foe*."

We have placed the emphasis on the words of this writer. A "mortal foe" act as "agent" to send three souls to eternal bliss!! "Employed," too, by the "king of terrors!!" Tremendous! Where are we? Have we gone back to Babel? What "confusion" of language! The king of terrors employ a "mortal foe" to translate the soul to eternal bliss"!!! "All the world wondered after the beast," &c. Well they might, if he performed such miracles as is here ascribed to the king of terrors.

The reader will pardon us for inserting the following effusion of an immortal-soulists' *poetical* fancy. It was composed on the death of a child "*three* weeks and five days old."

"Farewell, dear babe, a short farewell,
From father and mother;
You have gone with angels to dwell,
When there you will see your grandmother."

PSALM 16: 10—It is argued from this text, "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," that there is a distinction in death between the destiny of the soul and body; and that the soul must be conscious when the person is dead. But we ask.

Was the *body*, merely, the "Holy One? Or, did not that expression include the entire being of the person? We think it did. "Thou wilt not leave my *soul in hell*." What is hell, in this expression? Do you say it is not the *grave* but the invisible state of departed spirits. Well, have it just which way you please; we care not which; and then we will prove the soul was unconscious in that state. What is the Hebrew word here translated hell? It is "*Sheol*." It is the same word used in Eccl. 9: 10, Now let us put the two texts together. "Thou wilt not not leave my soul in *sheol*," "For there is no work, nor *knowledge*, nor wisdom in *sheol* whither thou goest." If we can understand words, then, here is demonstration, strong as the Bible can make it, that while under the power of death the *soul* has *no knowledge*; hence there must be a resurrection of the dead, or the person is perished for ever.

A KNOTTY QUESTION.—A man puzzled himself with the following question—"What will be the consequence if an irresistable force should come in contact with an immovable body?" To this question he answered—"I suppose it would knock a hole in it." A wit replied—"Knock a hole in what?—the irresistable force, or the immovable body?" and added—"It is impossible to do such a thing to a *force*; and if the hole is knocked in the *body*, some part will give way, which will show it is not immovable."

We could not help thinking that immortal-soulists are puzzling themselves in precisely a similar way. We will state the puzzle for them—"What will be the consequence if an unquenchable and devouring fire should come in contact with an indestructible, or, which is the same thing, an immortal soul?" Would it burn "a hole in it?" or, what would it do? You know "the fire can't go out," and it is a *devouring* fire: but it can't devour itself, if it did it would "go out;" it can't devour the soul for "that is indestructible;" and if it should produce any effect upon it, that would prove it not immortal, or indestructible! Pray, Mr. Immortal-Soulist, what will you do? Had you not better own the truth, *viz*:—"*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*" Ezek. 18: 4, 20; and the "*fire shall consume both soul and body.*" Isa. 10: 16, 17; and, therefore, the theory that the soul is immortal, by creation, or inherently so, is a fable?

WE have not judged it necessary to give any detailed account of the foreign news in the Examiner, as we presume all our readers have access to those papers which publish it immediately on its arrival. As our issue is but once a month, we can merely find place for such remarks upon events in the east, as we think will serve to illustrate prophecy, and show us the position we occupy in the history of this age, as shadowed forth in the word of truth. We have kept our eyes on the east for the last three years, watching with deep interest all the movements there, and expecting the breaking to pieces of European Monarchies prior to the second advent. We are not of those who say—"Nothing remains now to be done before the advent." We are confident, that unless we greatly mistake the prophecies, there are several things yet to transpire prior to that glorious event. We look for a *confederacy* between France and Italy; also, for a large *emigration* of Jews, from various parts of Europe, "to the land wherein their fathers have dwelt," *viz*: *Palestine*. We look, after that, that Russia, who is the Gog of Ezek. 38 and 39, and the Emperor thereof, the "king of the north," Dan. 11: 40, and onward, "shall overflow and pass over" Constantinople, Palestine, and Egypt; but, making a stand in Palestine, with his mighty and overwhelming army, will be there overwhelmed and destroyed with all his hosts. Then at that time—while the hosts of Russia are in Palestine, we think the advent will occur. Such are the events we are looking for. Time will soon determine whether we are right; for that we wait.

DEATH THREATENED TO ADAM.

NOT MORAL, NOR SPIRITUAL, BUT LITERAL.

Some contend, that death was a moral death. Such a view involves the greatest absurdity, and confounds language. We shall see this by an examination of those texts in Moses and the Prophets, where the phrase "*surely die*" occurs. If we find it is never employed by them to signify moral death, but invariably a literal one, then we shall have no right to give Gen. 2: 17, any other interpretation than that of dissolution, or a disorganization of man, so that he shall be resolved into the elements from which he was produced by his Maker. "*Ye shall surely die*," said the Creator. The next place in which we find this phrase, from the mouth of God, is Gen. 20: 7, in his language to Abimelech, when he commanded him to restore Abraham his wife, and added—"If thou restore her not, know thou that thou *shalt surely die*, thou and all that are thine." Surely, this was not "a moral death" that was threatened. We next find king Saul using the phrase, 1 Sam'l. 14: 39, 44. He had prohibited the people from eating any thing till evening on the day that God had wrought by the hand of Jonathan, a deliverance to Israel, and a discomfiture to the Philistines. Jonathan, not hearing his father's curse, had eaten honey. Saul having suspected that some one had disobeyed his order, declares that even though it should prove to be Jonathan, his son, "*he shall surely die*." When the lot was cast, Jonathan was taken, and Saul says—"*Thou shalt surely die*, Jonathan." Was it "a moral death" that Saul threatened? Surely all see that it was no such thing. Again, 1 Saml. 22: 16, king Saul told Abimelech, the priest of the Lord—"Thou shalt *surely die*., thou and all thy father's house." This sentence the wicked Doeg executed, as we learn in the 18th verse, and "slew

four score and five persons that did wear a linen ephod." No moral death here. In 1 Kg. 2: 37, king Solomon told Shimei, who had cursed David in his life time, that he should "*surely die*" it he went out of Jerusalem; but Shimei violated this command; Solomon called him to an account, and questioned him whether he had not stated definitely to him that he should "surely die on the day" that he should leave Jerusalem to go "any wither;" verse 42. "Benaiah then fell upon Shimei that he died;" verse 46; not "a moral death."

Again, when Jeremiah, in the days of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, had declared the words of the Lord against Jerusalem, &c., "the priests and prophets and all the people took him, saying, Thou shalt *surely die*." Were they about to put Jeremiah to "a moral death?" See Jer. 26: 8.

We will now turn to Ezk. 3: 18—"When I say to the wicked, *Thou shalt surely die*, &c.," is that a moral death? If so, it may read thus—When I say to the wicked [that is, to the *morally dead*] thou shalt surely die a moral death, &c. Is that sense? Are not the *wicked* already morally dead? Are there two moral deaths? It is undoubtedly a "second death" that is threatened in this text, because the connection shows it is a death from which the wicked man may escape if he will turn from his wickedness. The same language is twice repeated chapter 33: 8, 14; and there it is added, "If he turn from his sin, he shall surely live, he shall not die." Here then, it is evident, it is a *literal* death that is spoken of, and not a moral one. Also, in chapter 18: 13, the Lord, in speaking of a vile sinner, says—"He shall surely die; his blood shall be upon him." This threatening has nothing to do in inflicting a moral death—it is a literal death—an extinction of life: "*he shall not live.*" Thus far, then, in Moses and the Prophets, we find nothing to give countenance to the notion that the Lord ever used the phrase "Thou shalt surely die," to mean a moral death. But we have not done with the examination.

Numbers, 26: 65, Just before the Israelites entered into Canaan, they were numbered, and "not a man of them whom Moses and Aaron numbered in the wilderness of Sinai" was there, save Joshua and Caleb, "For the Lord had said of them, *They shall surely die* in the wilderness." Not a moral death, but a literal one, as the event demonstrated. When Manoah and his wife had seen "the angel of the Lord," and knew he was an angel, Jud. 13: 22, "Manoah said unto his wife, We shall *surely die*, because we have seen God." Was it "a moral death" that he spoke of? 1 Saml. 20: 31, king Saul commanded Jonathan to send and fetch David, "for he shall *surely die.*" No moral death in this matter. When David's anger was kindled against the man who had taken his neighbor's ewe lamb, 2 Saml. 12: 5, he said—"As the Lord liveth, the man that hath done this thing shall *surely die.*" The Lord told David on that occasion, verse 14, "the child that is born unto thee shall *surely die*;" and the child did die, not a moral death, but literally, actually returned to dust. In 2 Kg. 1: 4, the Lord, by Elijah the prophet, told king Ahasiah, "*Thou shalt surely die*," and repeats the same language to him, verse 16; and it is added, verse 17, "So he died according to the word of the Lord which Elijah had spoken." One more instance and we have every place where the phrase occurs in Moses and the Prophets: 2 Kg. 8: 10, the reply of Elisha the prophet to Hazael, who came to inquire of him about Ben-hadad, king of Syra, who was sick. The Prophet said—"The Lord hath showed me that he shall *surely die.*" We are not left in doubt as to what this death was, for Hasael smothered Ben-hadad "so that he died."

Thus, then, we see there is not a solitary example from Moses or the Prophets, to give countenance, in the slightest degree, to the notion that the phrase "surely die," means "a moral death;" but always and invariably a literal death or disorganization of the man, by which he ceases to live in any condition. The context to Gen. 2: 17, shows conclusively *that* was the death to be executed on Adam for his sin. "DUST THOU ART, AND UNTO DUST SHALT THOU RETURN."

Those who maintain that moral death was the penalty—"In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," and that the penalty followed in that twenty-four hours, are involved in the necessity of denying that literal death, or the death of the body was any part of the penalty, as the man did not *actually* die that day. If the penalty did not include the body, or the physical man, its death is an *arbitrary* act, without any reason, and contrary to all ideas we have of justice; because it was inflicting upon man that of which he had no notice, and did not therefore suspect any such danger. If a law was enacted that a man holding a *political office* who should act in a certain manner should suffer a political death, I ask if all civilized nations would not cry out against us as a barbarous, wicked, and unprincipled people if we not only removed that man from office, but actually put him to death by hanging or otherwise?

The threatening, Gen. 2: 17, was a plain expression of the purpose of God, in case man sinned, to deprive him of that life he had given him at his creation: the phrase is never used in any other sense, as the Bible plainly shows. We will, however, add one more argument on this point. Compare Gen. 2: 17, "Thou shalt surely die," with the following texts. In Gen. 6: 7, God said to Noah, "I will *destroy* man whom I have created," &c Verse 13, "The end of all flesh is come before me—I will *destroy* them with the earth." Verse 17, "Behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to *destroy* all flesh, wherein is the *breath of life*, from under heaven; and every thing that is in the earth *shall die.*" Chap. 7: 4, "Every living substance that I have made will I *destroy* from off the face of the earth." Then the Lord brought the flood he had threatened. Was a moral death the result? Read verses 21-23. "And all flesh died that moved upon the the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils *was* the breath of life, of all that *was* in the dry *land*, died. And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained *alive*, and they that *were* with him in the ark."

Here, then, is God's definition of *death*. It is to take away, not moral life, but man's "*breath of life*" out of his "nostrils"—that which he gave at man's creation: [Gen. 2: 7,] it is to "destroy" him, so that he is literally—*physically dead*. Such is the death the Lord threatened to Adam. Under this death he and all his posterity would forever

remain but for the resurrection by the second Adam. Such a death will be the wages of personal sins; or, a second death, to all who will not come to Christ that they may have life. Though recovered from the death experienced through Adam, a "second death," *like the first*, will be the lot of all impenitent and unbelieving sinners: a death from which there is no resurrection: IT IS ETERNAL.

PROPHETIC PERIODS.—NO. VIII.

We gave our readers in the Examiner for May, our views of the commencement and termination of the 1260 days, or years, of Dan. 7th. If that period commences with the decree establishing the bishop of the *city* of Rome as "Universal Bishop," then we can see no reason for fixing the commencement earlier than A. D. 604 to 607. We stated the fact, in that article, that "The Emperor Mauricius assembled a Council of the Patriarchs, all the Senators of the Imperial city, [Constantinople] and the Metropolitans," in the year 588, and that, "By this great Council was confirmed to John of Constantinople, the Title of Universal Bishop, to be enjoyed by him and his successors in that See." Bower's History of the Popes, Vol. 2, p. 459, London Edition, 1750. We expressed the opinion, that it was "not probable" that that was the date of the Papal Supremacy. One reason of that doubt was, that we supposed it necessary to look to the *city* of Rome for its appearance. On further reflection, however, we are not certain but that we are to look to the *Imperial City* of the *Roman Empire* for its date. If so, then 588 may be the true date of the Papal Supremacy. It is also true that the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, conferred by Phocas 604 to 607, was but the TRANSFER of the title and authority of Universal Bishop from the Bishop of Constantinople; and hence, *possibly*, the true date of the Supremacy may be from the *act* of the Council of the Imperial City. If that is the case, 1848 will witness its final overthrow or destruction. But that settles not the question of the year of the advent; for, a careful examination of the prophecies will show, that the little horn or man of sin is to be *destroyed* BEFORE the "coming" of "the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven;" and its destruction is one of the most prominent SIGNS of that coming, as the departure of darkness is the sign of the approach of the sun in the morning of day. Paul, in 2 Thes. 2: 8, speaking of that wicked man of sin, says:—"Whom the Lord shall *consume* with the *spirit of his mouth*, ["The *words* that I *speak* unto you," saith Jesus, "they are *spirit*, and they are life,"] and shall *destroy* with [what? his *coming*? no—but with] the BRIGHTNESS of his coming." The destruction is *before* the coming, and the *infallible* precursor of the advent itself. Then it may as certainly be *known* that the advent "is nigh, even at the doors," as the light that precedes the sun, scattering the darkness, testifies that the orb of day is about to appear.

The truth, the words, the spirit of Christ's mouth was first to "consume" the man of sin: this has been going on since the Reformation: then, as the time came nearer for the appearing of the Son of Righteousness, "*the brightness*" of that coming, even before his actual appearance, would "destroy" that power which had so long kept the world in darkness. Even while the judgment was sitting on the fourth beast, Dan. 7: 10, 11, which commenced A. D. 1789, and is still progressing to its conclusion, even during this period, the "little horn," the Papal power, was to be speaking "great words:" but "the beast" was to be "slain;" which slaying took place between 1789 and 1815; then its "body" was to be "destroyed;" which has been going on since 1815, by the spread in Europe of those principles which are destruction to despotism; and only one thing remains relative to that fourth beast, that is, to give its body "to the burning flame;" which is either now going on, or soon to be done, as it is accomplished under the seventh vial of the seven last plagues: with that beast is destroyed the little horn, the man of sin—the Papal power, and all other ecclesiastical despotisms which bear the character of "daughters" of that "Mother of Harlots."

The judgment, Dan. 7th, is not the same as that Rev. 20: 11—15: though some of the language is borrowed from the scenes of the judgment of the great day. In Daniel 7th, there is no mention of the heaven and earth fleeing away, nor of the judgment of dead or living men in their individual capacity: and it is not till after that judgment that one like the Son of Man is seen coming in the clouds of heaven. From the whole chain of prophecy we conclude—the fourth beast, the despotic governments of Europe, which are the horns of that beast, are to be destroyed; and the little horn is to be destroyed at the same time, and at a time, too, when it was expecting to "sit as a Queen and see no sorrow," and be speaking "great words;" and this not by the actual advent of our Lord, but by the increasing light, or "brightness" of his near approach; and is to be the sure and unmistakable "sign of the Son of Man in heaven;" being the completion of that chain of signs, the seven last plagues, which were designed to notify the watchful of the certain approach of their Lord, to take "the kingdom under the whole heaven."

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.—NO. II.

IV. HUMAN CREEDS REND THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD AND ENSLAVE HIS FREE-BORN CHILDREN.

In illustrating this position, we will suppose, that now, for the first time, the gospel is preached in a city; a great turning to God takes place, and hundreds of souls are born of the Spirit: they are of one heart, and of one soul—they *all love one another*, and thus give the very evidence by which Jesus Christ our Lord said "All men shall know that ye are my disciples." Will any one dare to say, that these loving souls do not constitute the *true* church of God in that city, and that, too, without any of that human arrangement called "gathering into the church"? We think the position is too plain to need argument.

These persons all continue in this loving communion and fellowship till there come in a Baptist, a Methodist, a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, &c — What is the work of these different sects? Not to kindle the flame of love higher; no, it is to gather the converts into *their* church! "They have not yet united with *the* church?" So out of *kindness*, to be sure, each sect sets itself to work to show its creed; or which is the same thing, to prove their peculiar views are right, and all the rest are wrong. Each party salutes the young converts' ears in this way, and is careful to keep up an impression that they are not yet in the "visible church," but that they

ought to join somewhere. This process is continued 'till, the first we perceive, the revival stops. What's the matter? The minds of the converts have been diverted from the unity of love to contemplate the discordant doctrines, or creeds, that have been presented, for their consideration, in order to their uniting with some church!—They lose sight of the fact, that they all belong to the church of God; and the question is, whether they shall unite with the Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, or what church they shall join. At first they think they *cannot be separated*—they must all go *together some where*. They have no fear of quarrelling because they may not think exactly alike on doctrine; "we must go together," is the spontaneous feeling of every new-born soul. But the strong efforts of the sectaries are kept up day and night, 'till some converts begin to lean *this way* and some *that*. Now a painful sensation, indescribably painful, is felt; they find they *must part*; they still resolve, it may be, that they will love one another; but it seems as though their hearts would be rent in pieces. It *must be done*, however, for they *must* unite with some *visible* church.

The work now goes on, and they are gathered hither and thither; this is not all, they must learn the vocabulary of their sect or party, that they may know how to make proselytes. When they meet those who have not gone with them, their conversation is not on the love of Christ to their souls, but the time is spent on these doctrinal points which separate them; and that, not to weigh candidly for information, but to *proselyte*: to make it appear that our creed is right, and yours wrong. If they fail in making the person a convert to their sect, "evil surmising" creeps into the heart—the person is stupid, or ignorant, or proud, or something else. Thus a death-blow is struck to the "first love," and, most likely, the disappointed person becomes a bigoted sectarian. Thus the Church of God, the true Church, is rent in pieces; brotherly love is broken up; and those who were born free are enslaved by the "doctrines and commandments of men." Now, the speech that is heard, when you meet many of them, is as opposed to the pure language uttered by them, in their first love, as the language of the dark pit is to the language of the New Jerusalem. What has done all this? The introduction of man-made creeds to divide and rend asunder what God had joined together. If this state of things is not perpetual, it is because there are temporary revivals, in which, for a time, all parties keep their creeds, or peculiarities, out of sight; but the leaders begin to grow jealous lest an opposing sect should secure the greatest number of converts; then the revival stops, and the *drama is acted over again.*

V. HUMAN CREEDS BEGET HATRED INSTEAD OF LOVE, EVEN AMONG THOSE WHO WERE FRIENDS BEFORE THEY PROFESSED RELIGION.

It is impossible fully to describe the mischievous effects of man-made creeds in this respect. We have, in part, anticipated, under the previous head, the proof of the above proposition. To enter into a full expose of the truth, on this point, would be to write the history of the professed churches for the last fifteen or sixteen hundred years—it would be to give an account of the persecutions, wars, and bloodshed, which have disgraced the name of Christianity; all engaged in, of course, to put down heretics? Or, in other words, to defend *human creeds*; the work of *fallible* men; who had the arrogance to assume that they had the right to dictate to their fellow-men how they should interpret God's blessed Word.

Who has not before his eye, within his own knowledge, exhibitions of the most unjustifiable hatred and bitterness towards those of a different creed from themselves? A minister, not a thousand miles off, in high standing in one of the largest denominations in the United States, manifested such a hatred to the ministers of another sect, that he would not so much as speak to them when he met them. Multitudes of others, who have shown, to the faces of their opponents kindness, have indulged in the most bitter language behind their backs; and all because their *creeds differed*. We have known men, Christian men, that spoke with extreme doubt whether one of another denomination could be saved, but finally concluded, that it was POSSIBLE *some of them might be*. Why this spirit? Human Creeds had blinded their minds; and this is the natural result of separating the children of God by such tests.

Now look at that neighborhood where harmony and union prevails; yet, none profess religion. God visits them in mercy, and their love and attachment is made stronger by the strong bonds of love to Christ. Presently human creeds are introduced among them—distraction and division follow; shortly there is less brotherly love and good-will than before any of them professed religion: the happiness that was once enjoyed in that community has departed. What has done this deed? Will you say—it was necessary in order to be agreed in some *plan* of operations! Alas! for that religion, that must *divide* what God has joined together to carry out *its plans.*

THE SON OF GOD.—NO. IV.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIVINE TESTIMONY RESPECTING THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF THOSE PERFECTIONS BY WHICH THE SON OF GOD CREATES, GOVERNS, SAVES AND JUDGES THE WORLD.

BY HENRY GREW.

We have seen in Col. 2: 9, that in Jesus Christ "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." A few verses before this, chap. 1: 19, the inspired apostle informs us, "*it pleased the Father*, that in him should *all fulness dwell.*" Here then the divine testimony teaches us that it is by *the pleasure of the Father*, that the Son possesses this divine fulness. It ought to be particularly observed, that this last passage is in immediate connection with the 16th and 17th verses, which declare him to have created all things, and to be before all things. This must refer certainly to his *highest character*. It consequently teaches us, that he possesses his *highest and most glorious perfections* by the pleasure of the Father. The apostle represents even saints being "filled with all the fulness of God," Eph. 3: 19. This, indeed, must be understood as vastly inferior to the fulness which Christ possesses. The creation of the universe is ascribed to the Son. John 1: 3: Col. 1: 16, &c. But do the Scriptures of truth teach us that he created all things by his own *independent* power, or that he was the glorious *agent* of "the only true God?" Eph. 3: 9,—God, who created all things BY Jesus Christ. Heb. 1: 1, 2, God—hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son, BY whom also HE made the worlds.

These passages certainly teach us that it was by *the power of the Father*, that the Son created the worlds. His creating all things, therefore, affords no proof that he is omnipotent.

In Heb. 1: 3, Jesus Christ is represented as "upholding all things by the word of his power," Certainly this must be in his *highest character*. Yet the apostle explains this by informing us that he was *made* so much better than the angels.

In Acts 2: 22, all the miracles which the Savior wrought on earth are ascribed to *the power of the Father*. "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs which *God did by him* in the midst of you. In Matt. 28: 18, and John 17: 2, All power in heaven and in earth is ascribed to Christ. Is not this descriptive of *the highest* power he possesses? Does he possess it *independently?* Let us hear and believe "the faithful witness." "All power is GIVEN unto me," &c. "As thou hast GIVEN him power over all flesh, that he should give *eternal life* to as many as thou hast given him." Here we are plainly taught that the whole power, by which the Son of God accomplishes the redemption of his church, is *given* him by the Father. Shall we then continue to say, that no *given* power, that nothing less than independent omnipotence can qualify him for such a work? Is not this to say, that the means divine wisdom employs for the redemption of men are *inadequate?*

Prof. Stuart, of Andover, Mass., remarking on the character of Christ as *Judge*, observes, "*omnipresence* and *omniscience only* can qualify him for the duties of that station." He admits that, "he does indeed *act* as judge by delegated authority. Let John 17: 2, be again considered. Does not the giving eternal life to the saints, include his *judging them and the world?* Or, if this should be denied; does it require any *more* wisdom, or knowledge, or power to *judge the world*, than it does to give *eternal life* to his people? Most certainly it does not. Here, then, it obviously appears from the divine testimony, that he is not only appointed to "*act* as judge, by delegated authority," but that the very *qualification* by which he acts, not only in the single office of judging the world; but in the arduous and glorious work of *giving eternal life* to his sheep, is *given* him by the Father. I do not perceive how Mr. Stuart can reconcile the above observation with the following remark of his, in another work: "I can conceive it possible, that a derived being may have such an unlimited communication of power, and knowledge, and wisdom, that he may govern worlds." He who governs worlds is surely competent to judge them.

We have seen from the words of the Lord, that our divine Redeemer is qualified for the important work appointed him, in respect to wisdom and knowledge. Col. 2: 3, "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." John 2: 25, He knew what was in man. Rev. 2: 23, I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts.

He is worthy to take the book of the divine counsels, and to unloose the seals thereof. He only reveals to us, and to the powers of the heavenly places, the purposes of Jehovah, unfolding to our admiring view, the works of grace and love and holy vengeance of "the only true God." And how doth he obtain this knowledge of all things? What saith the Scripture? "The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him." Rev. 1: 1.

Titus 3: 4—6, But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness, which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly THROUGH Jesus Christ our Savior. This passage, and many others prove that the Son saves us by the appointment and power of the Father. It also proves how erroneous that common idea is, that wherever the word Savior occurs in a text, the Son of God must be intended.

John 8: 26, he that sent me is true, and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him. John 12: 49, 50, For I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, &c. John 3: 31, 32, He that cometh from heaven is above all, and what he hath seen and heard that he testifieth.

It appears equally evident from "the oracles of God," that Jesus Christ will judge the world, by the power and appointment of the Father. Acts 10: 42, It is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. Rom. 2: 16, God shall judge the secrets of men BY Jesus Christ. John 5: 22, For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son.

Jer. 23: 6, it is said of the Son of God, "and this is his name whereby he shall be called, the LORD our righteousness. Jer. 23: 16, it is said of Jerusalem, "this is the name wherewith she shall be called, the LORD our righteousness," not because either the Son or people of Jehovah are literally Jehovah, but because, in them, Jehovah is pleased to accomplish his gracious purpose of salvation. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," &c. Even places where God displayed his power and goodness were called by his name. "Jehovah-jireh." "Jehovah-nissi."

When we contemplate the holy Son of God in the endearing character of the "one mediator between God and man," what a glory do we behold encircling him in all his offices!

As our PROPHET, he "spake as never man spake." His doctrine distilled as the dew. "Grace was poured into his lips." Psa. 45: 2. Blessed teacher! The knowledge thou dost impart is life to our souls. Oh, may we never turn away from "him that speaketh from heaven."

As our PRIEST, how precious is his offering and intercession! We have the "remission of sins through his blood." He "ever liveth to make intercession for us." He is "made higher than the heavens;" "a great high priest, Jesus the Son of God."

As our KING, he is "fairer than the children of men." He is, "King of kings and Lord of lords." By the power of his grace he conquers the hearts of men, and subjects them to his righteous government. O blessed Prince of peace! O precious reign of grace! He will present his redeemed church before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy. He shall triumph over all his foes. Those who will not have him to reign over them he will punish "with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Then shall he "be glorified in his saints, and admired in them that believe."

Let it, however, be remembered, that it is the Father who is "the only true God," that has exalted him, and upholds him in this high station. Deut. 18: 18, I will raise them up a prophet, &c. As a priest he is "made higher than the heavens." So Christ glorified not himself to be made an high

priest; but he that said unto him, thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee. Heb. 5: 5; Psal. 2: 6, Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion.

The case of Joseph, who appears to have been a striking type of Christ, may serve to illustrate, in some manner, the Scriptural representation of the glorious dignity of the Son of God, and also his dependence on the Father for all his authority. Gen. 41: 39--44, And Pharaoh said unto Joseph—thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou. And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, see I have set thee over all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh took off his ring from his hand and put it on Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck. And he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had, and they cried before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, I am Pharaoh, and without thee shall no man lift his hand or foot in all the land of Egypt.

Such was the high authority with which Pharaoh invested Joseph: in consequence of which, he was, in a sense, honoured even as they honoured Pharaoh; for it was said to him, "Thou art even as Pharaoh;" Gen. 44: 18, Joseph was exalted to the government of Egypt; and was indeed more actively ruler, than Pharaoh himself. Yet Pharaoh was greater than Joseph. From Pharaoh he derived all his dignity, and on his sovereign will he was dependent for all his authority. Pharaoh governed Egypt by Joseph. Pharaoh saved Egypt during the famine by Joseph. He gave him a name, said to signify a Saviour, and commanded all to bow the knee to Joseph.

So "the eternal Spirit," who is and ever must be the alone God, creates, upholds, governs and saves by his Son, "whom he hath appointed heir of all things," whom he hath "made better than the angels;" and whom, on account of all judgement being committed to him, he requires us to honor even as we honor the Father. I have no idea that the case of Joseph, or any other, can present to the mind an adequate parallel of the incomparable Immanuel.

> "Nor earth, nor seas, nor sun, nor stars,
> Nor heaven his full resemblance bears;
> His beauties we can never trace,
> Till we behold him face to face."

Far be it from us to rob the Saviour of his true glory. Far be it from us to deny his own testimony. Let us not be found uniting with the Jews in charging "the faithful witness" with advancing claims to a character he never assumed: a charge which Jesus himself immediately repelled in the plainest language. John 5: 19. How delusive is the impression, that we are honoring the Son of God while we deny his own testimony?

Let none, however, imagine, that we can have too exalted views of the sinner's friend, that we can adore him too highly, or love him too ardently, while in accordance with the inspired testimony, we behold him as "the image of the invisible God;" and worship him "to the glory of God the Father." Let our minds expand to the utmost stretch of thought in the contemplation of his divine beauty and glorious dignity: still our conceptions of his incomparable excellence will be vastly too limited and inadequate. Let our hearts glow with the most fervent love, and our bosoms heave with the warmest gratitude to his dear name, still we must acknowledge that our affections towards him bear no proportion to his charms or his love. With our highest notes of praise, we must mingle the sigh of lamentation, that we admire and love and praise him no more.

> "Had we a thousand lives to give,
> A thousand lives should all be thine."

Dr. J. F. Lee, Meltonsville, N. C., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—Please send me two hundred copies of your Six Sermons, quarto form. The tone of some has changed already, while others are *rabid* in their denunciations. "When fortune smiles, distrust her; when she frowns, defy her," is a sentiment uttered by some writer. And while I regret and deplore the *insane wisdom* of some, instead of ceasing to excite their excitability, by the circulation of the doctrines contained in your six sermons, &c., which to them is so offensive, I intend to spread said doctrine as widely as I possibly can. Engaged in extensive practice, you know that my time is not my own. Necessity as well as duty compel me to attend to the sick, and since I cannot daily preach the word, I will endeavor to distribute your sermons, so that they may sound in the ears of thousands, who, perhaps, might never in any other way hear the truth upon the same subject. What I fail to do in point of preaching, your sermons will more than fulfil.

Walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of his Holy Spirit, I shall fear no evil. I could, if I had time, tell you many interesting and amusing, and at the same time, saddening, if not humiliating circumstances, arising from a misconception of the doctrine in your sermons. A sermonizer, in endeavouring to unfold the *Nobility* of the soul, said "it is the Essence of Deity." Oh, what an idea! The soul of the wicked is the Essence of Deity!! Into what *unmixed* blasphemy will error lead men who are esteemed for their piety.

"Dum insanientis sapientiæ consultus—erró."

Well may such exclaim,

> "I missed my mark and lost my way
> By crack-brained wisdom led astray."

This same preacher imagined that his definition of the soul would demolish Dr. Lee and George Storrs.

I wish to sustain you, my dear Brother, as far as I possibly can, trusting that God in his unbounded love will abundantly bless you and yours, and prepare you for every good work, that you may be instant in season, and out of season.

Br. D B Eldred, Homer, Mich., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—I have more good news to give you relative to the spread of the truth. Some new ground has been broken up by the aid of a copy of the "Six Sermons" which I sent to a brother of my wife, in Nankin, Washtanaw Co. A Conference has been appointed there, which I shall try to attend, after which I will write you again.

Yours, waiting for the *Restitution*.

MERRIMEW & THOMPSON, PRINTERS, 7 CARTER'S ALLEY

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST, 1848. No. 8.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

DR. TYNG AND THE TRUTH.

In a late number of the "Christian Observer," we find a report of a meeting "to evangelize the Jews," at which DR. TYNG made the following pertinent remarks:

"*Resolved*, That the signs of the times are such as should rouse all who love the Lord Jesus Christ, and wait for his salvation, to renewed earnestness and enlarged effort in this holy enterprise."

"I have come, though not well, (said Dr. Tyng,) to show my interest in this cause—a cause than which, in my opinion, there is not another in the whole circle of Christian effort more dear to Jesus. The resolution refers to a specific connection between the conversion of the Jews and the coming of that peculiar time foretold in the Scriptures; and it speaks of an increase of effort demanded as that time draws nigh. There are those who think that the time referred to, is to be preceded by a long and gradual progress of light, intermingled with darkness; but the speaker saw nothing in history, nor in the language of prophecy, to convince him of the truth of this opinion. He did not believe that the harvest is to be gathered by instrumentalities now in use. He looked for a new dispensation, when the Sun of Righteousness shall suddenly beam forth, like the breaking out of the glorious sun from the zenith of the midnight concave. He looked for the return of the Divine Redeemer, when the Jew 'should look upon him whom they had pierced, and mourn as one mourneth for an only son.' In that day, Jerusalem shall take her stand of predicted glory, and become the metropolis of a magnificent empire. There surely comes a time when there shall be overturning and overturning, till he, whose right it is, shall reign, and the crown and the diadem return to him to whom they belong.

We now see all the prophecies coming to a conclusion. Babylon has been swallowed up by the Persian Empire, and that by the Macedonian, and that by the Grecian, and that by the Roman. Rome, too, has been divided into ten parts or kingdoms, each one of which is now heaving, and threatened with ruin. Every event that transpires, goes to fix the coming of the Saviour as near. Never were there such overturnings, as in these days. Soon he will come forth in glorious triumph, and set himself upon the mountain of his holiness, and reign upon the throne of his glory; and those nations that will not serve him, shall be trodden under foot. Surely the signs of the times are such as should arouse us to renewed earnestness and effort, in seeking the salvation of Israel. In conclusion, (said Dr. Tyng,) I will read, as embodying what else I may be expected to say on this resolution, those lines of Charlotte Elizabeth, each one of which contains a reference to some part of Scripture. The piece is entitled,

"SIGNS OF THE TIMES."

When from scattered lands afar,	Matt. 24: 6, 8.
Spreads the voice of rumored war,	Luke 21: 25.
Nations in tumultuous pride,	Haggai 2: 7.
Heave like ocean's roaring tide,	Heb. 12: 26, 29.
When the solar splendors fail,	Matt. 24: 29
When the crescent waxeth pale,	Rev. 16: 12.
And the powers that starlike reign,	Matt. 24: 29.
Sink dishonored to the plain,	Joel 11: 10, 31.
World! do thou the signal dread,	Luke 21: 26, 36.
We exalt the drooping head;	Luke 21: 37, 38.
We uplift the expectant eye,	Eph. 1: 14.
Our redemption draweth nigh;	Rom. 8: 19, 23.
When the fig-tree shoots appear,	Matt. 24: 22, 23.
Men behold their Summer near;	Luke 21: 29, 31.
When the hearts of rebels fail,	Isa. 59: 18, 19.
We the coming Conqueror hail.	Rev. 19: 11, 16.
Bridegroom of the weeping spouse,	Rev. 19: 7, 9.
Listen to her longing vows,	Rev. 6: 10.
Listen to her widowed moan,	Luke 18: 3, 7, 8.
Listen to Creation's groan.	Rom. 8. 22, 23.
Bid, O bid Thy trumpet sound,	I. Thess. 4: 16.
Gather thine elect around,	Matt. 24: 31.
Gird with saints Thy flaming car,	Jude 14.
Summon them from clime afar,	Isa. 24: 13—15.
Call them from life's cheerless gloom,	Matt. 24: 40, 41.
Call them from the marble tomb,	Rev. 20: 4—6.
From the grass-grown village grave,	Luke 14: 14.
From the deep dissolving wave,	Psalm 49: 14, 15.
From the whirlwind and the flame,	I. Thess. 4: 17.
Mighty Head, Thy Members claim.	Col. 1: 15.
Where are they whose proud disdain,	Luke 19: 12, 27.
Scorned to brook Messiah's reign?	Matt. 13: 41, 42.
Lo, in waves of sulphurous fire,	Luke 17: 27, 30.
Now they taste His tardy ire;	Rev. 19: 20, 21.
Fettered till the appointed day,	Rev. 18: 3, 5, 9.
When the world shall pass away,	II. Pet. 2: 9.
Quelled are all thy foes, O Lord,	Rev. 19: 15, 21.
Sheathe again the dreadful sword.	Psa. 110: 5, 7.
Where the Cross of anguish stood,	Isa. 53: 3, 5, 12.
Where Thy life distilled in blood,	Mark 15: 27.
Where they mocked Thy dying groan,	Mark 15: 29.
King of Nations, plant Thy throne,	Isa. 24: 23.
Send Thy law from Zion forth,	Zach. 8: 3.
Speeding o'er the willing earth;	Dan. 2: 35, 44.
Earth, whose Sabbath glories rise,	Isa. 40: 1, 9.
Crowned with more than Paradise;	Ps. 67: 6.
Sacred be the impending veil!	I. Cor. 13: 12.
Mortal sense and thought must fail,	I. John 3: 2.
Yet the awful hour is nigh,	Luke 21: 31.
We shall see Thee, eye to eye.	Rev. 1: 7.
Be our souls in peace possessed,	II. Thess. 3: 5.

While we seek our promised rest, Heb. 4: 9.
And from every heart and home, II. Tim. 4: 8.
Breathe the prayer, "O Jesus, come!" Rev. 22: 20.
Haste to set the captive free, Isa. 49: 9.
All Creation groans for Thee. Rom. 8: 19.

We invite the attention of Presbyterians, and all others influenced by the Doctor's authority, to the following items in the above extract:

1st. Dr. Tyng "did not believe that the harvest is to be gathered by instrumentalities now in use."

2d. "He looked for a new dispensation."

3d. He looked for the return of the Divine Redeemer, when the Jews "should look upon him whom they had pierced, and mourn as one mourneth for an only son."

4th. "*In that day*, JERUSALEM SHALL TAKE HER STAND OF PREDICTED GLORY, AND BECOME THE METROPOLIS OF A MAGNIFICENT EMPIRE."

5th. "We now SEE all the prophecies coming to a *conclusion*."

6th. "Every event that transpires, goes to *fix the coming of the Saviour near*."

The above points embody important truths concerning the Kingdom of God; and we cordially commend them to the attention of our readers.

J. T. W.

A SECOND REJOINDER TO DR. THOMAS.

BY HENRY GREW.

The essential importance to salvation of believing and obeying the Gospel of the Kingdom in respect to those who hear the Gospel, is as much my "impregnable position" as it is that of my friend; nor am I conscious of cherishing any more "love" or "charity," which is not in accordance with truth, than he has expressed. He remarks that "The truth belongs to God, not to me." True, but he must excuse me for not admitting that all *his explanations* of the truth belong to God. I trust that, by divine favor, it is my love to God's truth, or what I understand to be such, that I oppose some of his views. My inmost soul responds to his remarks on the importance of an inflexible adherence to the word of the Lord.

NO MEN DIE PENITENT WITHOUT FORGIVENESS.

On Matthew 12: 32, Dr. T., in a former article, remarked—"Does not this imply that there are some offences, whether of omission or commission, that will be forgiven in a future age?" Had I not reason to suppose that my friend thought that some dying in impenitence would be forgiven? He however now explains more fully, and without affirming, he thinks it to be according to "the scope of the word," that some men of "penitence" must wait for forgiveness till the "Future Age," because, forsooth, the committee of the church had not the power of forgiving their sins in this! It appears to me that this speculation is a violation of an important principle of the divine government, and of the plain teaching of the Spirit of Truth, that "he that confesseth and forsaketh his sin shall find mercy." It was necessary indeed for the reformed Corinthian to receive forgiveness from the Church, in order to be restored to *their* fellowship, but this was not necessary in order to his being forgiven of God. If a man in similar circumstances, as my friend's case to illustrate the subject supposes, truly repents, God waits for no committees or churches to pardon him. "Let the wicked forsake his way—and let him return unto the Lord who will have mercy, and to our God who will abundantly pardon." So the Publican found it without going to the Council or Sanhedrim. Churches and Committees may err through partiality or imperfect judgment. Our intelligent friend, admitting that men dying in impenitence are never forgiven, asks, "What has that to do with *men of faith, dying in sins 'not unto death?'*" Here is another anomaly! What prophet or apostle ever taught that men of faith die in sins? If men of *dead* faith were intended, it is perfectly correct, but I do not so understand Mr. Thomas. I would remind my friend that Paul directed the Corinthian *Church* and not a "*Committee of brethren*," to "deliver" the offender "to Satan for the destruction of the flesh," &c.

UNIVERSAL RESURRECTION.

I have now to examine the single passage adduced by Mr. Thomas to prove the "non-resurrection of millions." Isa 26: 14. Isa. 25: 11, and 26: 13 are quoted, but the 14 ver. is the only one that has any word on the subject of "non-resurrection." Who are the lords that "had dominion" over Israel, of whom it is said "*they shall not rise?*" NATIONS, as my friend justly remarks, "Egyptians, Philistines," &c. This is confirmed by the 15 ver. It is the "*nation*" that the Lord removed far unto all the ends of the earth, thus scattering and destroying it. This explains the subject of their death, or destruction, or non-resurrection. As nations "they are dead," as nations "they shall not live." As nations "they are deceased, they shall not rise." Such is the fact respecting those powerful nations which once "tyrannized over Israel." The connection of the passage thus teaches that it is in perfect harmony with the plain declarations of inspired truth, that "ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth," &c. "there shall be a resurrection—of the *just and unjust*." "And I saw the dead, *small and great*, stand before God," &c. I object to our friend's comment on the word ALL in John 5: 28. Our Savior does not say, all *that have done good or evil* shall come forth, neither does the connection require us to limit his words to such. He says, "all *that are in the graves* shall come forth." All in the graves, whether "*small*" or "*great*," as John saw in prophetic vision, Rev. 20: 12, whether capable of moral action or not. The "all" in the 28 ver. therefore "is (not fully) defined in the next." The fact of those who are morally responsible for their actions receiving their due reward, is perfectly consistent with the resurrection of those who died too "small" to be thus accountable. The connexion consequently does not warrant the limitation. If it did, it would surely avail little to prove the non-resurrection of the lords over Israel, who did "evil" by wholesale. The word "all," if limited to those who have actually done good and evil, must include them.

Dr. T. remarks, "As to the Gentiles who had sinned without law," they perish. True, but *when* will they finally perish? "In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus

Christ." Rom. 2: 12 to 16. This proves their resurrection. It is equally evident from the 12 ver. and connection that those who "have sinned without law" (i. e. the written law) and those who have sinned in the law, shall be judged on the same day or period. By what authority does my friend connect the 16th ver. with a *part* of the 12th *only?* The apostle makes no such distinction as his remarks imply. He asks, "How would friend Grew judge Cossacks, Hottentots, Caffres," &c. "by Paul's Gospel, or Moses' law, who had never heard of the one or the other?"—"Where no law is, there is no transgression," and "without faith it is impossible to please God." These two principles decide the fate of millions. "Where there is no vision the people perish." Here I learn the source of my friend's error respecting the "non-resurrection of millions." It is a consistent inference from false premises. If indeed there is no other law given to man than the law of Moses and the Gospel, then have many no law by which they may justly be condemned. It is not so. "Cannot the reader see," and cannot Mr. T. see, that "the gentiles which have not the law (or the Gospel) are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another?" Rom. 2: 14, 15. No rational men are without all law, "because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that *they are without excuse;* because that *when they knew God they glorified him not as God,*" &c. Rom. 1: 19—21.

I can assure Mr. T. that my vision is not at all bewildered by "that little monosyllable '*all.*'" That it is often used in a limited sense, I am fully aware; nor is my belief that it is sometimes used in a literal sense, any proof to the contrary. Quoting Heb. 9: 27 from memory, I made a common mistake, inserting the word "all." I did not, however, give it in *capitals,* as my friend incorrectly quotes me. The passage is equally pertinent to my argument without that word as with it. My object was not to prove that all men die, but that all who do die are to be raised. "It is appointed unto men once to die; but *after this the judgment.*" It appears to me that Paul teaches that death and subsequent judgment are appointed unto the same persons, at least to those who are morally accountable, which the "lords" who had "dominion" over Israel certainly were.

FAITH IN PROPHETIC TRUTHS NECESSARY.

Mr. T. observes: "Mr. Grew doth not like my position, that 'a man cannot be saved in any sense, unless he also believe the *prophetic truths* concerning the kingdom of God.'" This is not a fair version of the matter. This is not the position which I object to. I know that "the subject matter of these truths is the kingdom, and the kingdom is the subject of the Gospel." "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." The position I object to, is this, "we must believe THE WHOLE truth, or—be dashed to atoms." So affirms the Doctor. *I* have put the objectionable words in capitals. The two positions are vastly different, as every intelligent reader must perceive. No man can believe the gospel without believing prophetic truths. "He that believeth not (the gospel) shall be condemned." Millions, however, have believed and obeyed the gospel, who have died without a knowledge of "*the whole* truth." If my learned friend is an exception, I believe him to be the first, except "the faithful witness," since the foundation of the world.

I am happy to see him recede from this position as he does in his last article To "believe the whole truth," implies, as I have wrote before, that we "discern accurately all things which all the prophets have foretold concerning the kingdom of God, and the true periods of their fulfilment," i. e. so far as these periods are recorded. Mr. T. himself says that "an incorrect belief of doctrine and facts is a belief of error." Mr. T. now says, "I am far from saying, that such a discernment is necessary to entitle a man to entrance in the kingdom of God." Very good. We will now hope that we shall not be "dashed to atoms," although we have not yet attained, neither are already perfect in the knowledge of "the whole truth." My friend will now have to furnish himself with an answer to such of his questions to me as the following: "Which of those particular truths have we authority to dispense with as unnecessary to salvation?" Most cordially do I join with him in saying "that illumination in the one thing is essential, not as a mere matter of knowledge, but that this knowledge may effect a renewal unto life through a participation in the divine nature." It will be in good time to call upon me "to adduce chapter and verse" to prove that men can "be saved without faith in the kingdom," when I affirm it. I respectfully ask my friend to exercise his rational powers sufficiently to discern the difference between having "faith in the kingdom," and having knowledge of "the whole truth;" also to discern the distinction between quoting the words of an author, as a happy expression of your own thoughts, and quoting him as "authority." No "Johns of any sect" will I "introduce," *as authority,* except the inspired Johns of the sect of the Nazarene.

IMMERSION NOT ABSOLUTELY ESSENTIAL TO SALVATION.

Dr. T. maintains that "repentance, immersion and holiness, are indivisibly essential to salvation in the kingdom of God." I object to this sentiment as unscriptural and absurd. I am, however, inaccurately represented in the following remarks: "The apostle Paul says: 'Repent and *be baptised,* EVERY ONE OF YOU, in the name of Jesus Christ.' It is not absolutely necessary, says Mr. Grew, for 'the immersed are not excluded from the holy kingdom of God.'" Now I say that *it is* absolutely necessary, in order to stand complete in all the will of God, but *not to salvation.* With respect to those *who know it to be their Master's will,* I do not deny that it is essential to salvation. I deny that "the effect of such teaching" is to influence any not to conform to the commandment, except it be those selfish souls who have no right to the ordinance, until they have love for God sufficient to induce them to do something more for his glory than what they suppose to be absolutely essential to their own salvation.

Dr. T.'s distinction between being "*weak in faith,*" and being "*weak in the faith,*" is of no avail to set aside the proof from Rom. 14: 1, that we

are bound by Christian law to receive those "who are in the faith" of Christ, who are weak or erroneous on the subject of immersion. To this law, which is as positive and important at least as that of immersion, there is no exception. A single exception would divide the body of Christ. The command requires the forbearance of all errors of judgment which are not totally incompatible with being in the faith of Jesus Christ.

So far from immersion being essential to being "in the faith," no man has any right to immersion who is not already in it. When the Eunuch declared his faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, Philip recognized him as a Christian and baptised him as such. It is true faith in Christ, which implies the principle of love, and willing subjection to Jesus, which constitutes us Christians. It is not necessary to "adduce a single case from the New Testament" of a person being recognised as a Christian who was weak or erroneous on the subject of immersion. It does not appear that there were any such. There was no occasion for it. The teaching of the apostles was perfectly harmonious, not diverse as that of the sects of later ages. The law of Rom. 14: 1 is just as authoritative now, as it would be if it had been applied to a thousand such cases in the apostolic age. The law itself is authority sufficient without any example. There is no way of evading it but by denying that the unimmersed are "in the faith." You may find "a white crow or a black swan" as easily as a single case in the New Testament of a person being recognised as a Christian who believed the Deity is three persons; shall we therefore deny the christianity of all such? My argument from 1 Cor. 8: 11, remains unrefuted. It is indeed easy to say, "this is no case in point," and as easy for me to say that it is. My friend says of the person referred to in the 7th verse, "His 'views of the unity of God and of idols were' not 'incorrect.' I say that the apostle affirms that they were. Now for the proof. "But to us there is one God, the Father of whom are all things and we in him; and our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him. *Howbeit there is not in every man that knowledge;* for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour eat it as a thing offered unto an idol: and their conscience being weak is defiled." Yet the Doctor says his views of the unity of God and of idols are not incorrect! Why then, I ask, was *his* conscience weak and defiled, any more than that of the apostle and others in eating such meat if he knew correctly, like them, "that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one?" I ask the reader to peruse the entire chapter and see whether or not the apostle does not argue the indivisibility of a correct knowledge of the unity of God and a correct knowledge of idols. It is manifest from the 7th verse that the person referred to had not a correct knowledge of idols; and from the whole connection it appears, that it was because he had not a correct knowledge of the unity of God, as the apostle most plainly declares in the 7th verse, the antecedent of which, is the unity of God in the 6th.

But "we all have knowledge" on these things, says Paul, my friend remarks, to prove that the views of the person referred to respecting the unity of God and idols were not incorrect. Paul shall explain himself how he uses the word "*all*" in this case. "We know that we all have knowledge—as concerning therefore the eating of those things offered in sacrifice unto idols, we know that an idol is nothing. *Howbeit*, there is not *in every man that knowledge*," &c. Such is the apostle's version of the word "*all*." Mr. Thomas contends for an exception in the word "all" in John 5: 28, where Jesus Christ makes none, but rejects one which the apostle here plainly and positively makes. Was it because "that he sees it dancing before his eyes like a will-o-the-wisp?"

BORN OF WATER.

Notwithstanding Dr. T.'s assurance, I am "rash enough to say" that this term does not necessarily mean baptism. As he excludes from salvation all the unimmersed, I hold him to adduce one passage which necessarily implies their exclusion from the kingdom of God. John 3: 5 is not such a passage. "Mr. Grew (does) regard Jesus as authority" in *all* cases; but not men's explanations of his words. I object to affixing the sense of literal immersion in water to this term "born of water" in this passage:

1. Because it is not according to the order of the Gospel to represent our being first baptized and then born of the Spirit, or to represent that these things are simultáneous. Men are born of the Spirit *previous* to their being qualified for baptism.

2. Because such a construction is a violation of those passages which connect salvation and inheritance in the kingdom of God with true repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, which *precede* immersion in water, according to the order of the Gospel. It may be said that according to this reasoning the penitent believer may be saved without subsequent obedience to the commands of the gospel. It is not so. True repentance, is reformation, and necessarily implies obedience to all the *known* commands of God, but it does not necessarily imply the knowledge of, or obedience to, the ordinance of immersion. There are true disciples of Christ who could not be immersed without sin; for "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." On this subject they are "weak, (*i. e.*, erroneous,) though in the faith.

3. Because the scriptures of truth furnish a better and more consistent construction. Compare Eph. 5: 25 to 27. "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it: that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word," &c. Here the renewing and sanctifying influence of the truth on the soul is represented by the washing of water. In John 3: 5 the same blessed work of divine favour is represented by being "born of water." Nor is there any tautology. Mr. T.'s "perfect *reductio ad absurdum*," is a man of straw of his own creation. We are under no necessity of giving his version of our views; "Except a man be born of spirit and of spirit." The phrase "born of water," refers to the *means* by which the work of renewing is done; born of the Spirit to the *agent* that does it. "Of his own will begat he us *with the word of truth*." The phrase born of water by the word, would be as proper as the phrase "washing of water by the word," found in Eph. 5: 26. Mr. T.'s positiveness respecting the import of the passage is the more remarkable, as he himself confesses that the word "born" is used as a "*metaphor*." Of what avail then is it for him to say that to be *literally* born, is "an emergence from a place in which the subject was previously out of sight." Does he not abandon this idea in respect to the term, born of the Spirit?

Surely he will not say that being born of the Spirit is "an emergence from (the Spirit)—in which the subject was previously out of sight;" but if a man may be metaphorically born of the Spirit without such an emergence, he may be metaphorically born of water, without such an emergence.

Finally, I object to the exposition because it involves the absurdity of the Almighty excluding from his kingdom those who love and serve him better than some whom he receives. It is in vain to deny that there are believers in the Gospel who, through false teaching, are in error on the subject of immersion, who, on the whole, are more like Christ, more devoted to the service of God, more obedient to his commands, more dead to the world, and better practical Christians, than some real Christians who are immersed. Surely we may demand something more than a "*metaphor*" to sustain such an incongruity in the divine government as this.

The fact of immersion being "*a gracious privilege*" is no proof that "it is not *the duty*" of the believer. It is both. Being a command, it is our duty to obey. Its being "worth nothing," if "submitted to as a mere duty," on the principle of selfishness, is no proof that it is not a duty.

I thank my respected friend for his caution. If, however, I am an "apologist for error, ignorance and disobedience," because I deny the absolute necessity of a discernment and practice of "*the whole* truth" in order to be saved, the Doctor now is so likewise, for he remarks, "I am very far from saying, that such a discernment is necessary to entitle a man to entrance into the kingdom of God." If to oppose the magnifying of error beyond truth, is to be an apologist for error, I wish to be such. Let my friend also "beware" and listen to a caution of higher authority: "Why dost thou judge thy brother, or why dost thou set at nought thy brother?" The unimmersed believers are not to be excluded from the christian brotherhood.

I would suggest for serious consideration, whether we do not break (I do not say one of the least, but) one of the important commandments in breaking the law of christian forbearance? Rom. 14: 1—4; 15: 7. It is because I wish to "do and teach" *all* the King's commandments, that I am endeavoring to teach my friend this law, and save him from the evil of rejecting those whom Christ receives, Rom. 15: 7; and of offending the little ones who believe in him.

In conclusion, noticing that my dissent from the construction given to Isa 26: 13, 14 subjects me to the charge of being "no sane man," I beg leave to say, "I am not mad, most" *modest* Doctor, "but speak the words of truth and soberness."

HENRY GREW.

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP—NO. III.

VI. HUMAN CREEDS PREVENT THE SPREAD OF THE GOSPEL—ROB GOD AND HIS POOR.

What is the greatest obstacle to the triumph of the Gospel among ourselves? It may be said—"The corruption of the human heart." But we ask, again, if the sectarian divisions, caused by the introduction of human creeds, as tests of our Christian regard, do not furnish the largest portion of *the food* by which the "corrupt heart" is nourished? Do not the unconverted find their strongest apology for neglecting religion, in the fact, that religionists cannot agree among themselves! He looks at the different creeds, conflicting as they do, and all claiming to be right, as so many proofs that *Revelation is full of contradictions;* and therefore unworthy his belief at all; and when he further sees *the spirit*, which these conflicting systems inspire, he concludes it is the natural result of the religion of the Bible, and so rejects that blessed book altogether, or concludes to have nothing to do with religion 'till its professors shall be more agreed among themselves. He says, it may be, I have peace with my neighbors, but if I become a *religionist*, I must take sides with some of these parties; this he resolves not to do; and, therefore, resolves not to have anything to do with a religion that must bring strife and contention where he now has peace. Multitudes, it is to be feared, are thus stumbling into perdition through the instrumentality of creed makers, and the divisions which are the result of these inventions of men. How many revivals have been prematurely brought to a close by beginning to *creedise* young converts, and even those *under conviction*, till their souls have been turned back to destruction.

Another way, in which human creeds prevent the spread of the Gospel, is, *The different creedists spend much time and labor to prove that their opponent's creed is false and absurd.* How much time is spent in this way it is impossible to tell: but, that very much is thus spent, none will deny. An aged minister once said, it was his opinion, that at least one half the time of ministers was taken up in this work. Perhaps he was not far out of the way, if we reckon *private* as well as public labor.

In consequence of the creed system, there must be two, three, four, or more, ministers employed in a field where *one*, with the assistance of experienced laymen, would be all that is necessary. Here, then, is a drawback to the spread of the Gospel, by taking the extra number from destitute places.

These extra ministers, in one place, not only prevent the spread of the Gospel, by being cut off from destitute fields, but absorb, for their support, the money that is needed to send the Gospel elsewhere. Nor is their support the only item; meeting houses must be built for each of them, and the people divest themselves of the means of sending the Gospel to the destitute, and perhaps involve themselves in debt and thus rob God, and cause their charities to the poor to be meagre indeed; and all for what? To keep up these *man-made arrangements* —human creeds and sectarian divisions.

Now, look at that country place, or small village where there are just enough, if they were left untrammelled with human creeds, to sustain an humble minister of Christ. The different creed-makers have corrupted their minds so that they cannot agree; and each party must content themselves with "occasional preaching." Each party, too, is jealous of the other, and if anything is preached by the *occasional preacher* that is opposed to the other's creed, their preacher, when he comes round, must spend his time, in his *occasional sermon*, in vindicating his own creed, and showing the absurdity of his opponent's. Thus neither party, in fact, is supplied with the pure preaching of the Gospel, or only in a very limited manner.

Let us see if this creed business has no effect in preventing the spread of the Gospel among the heathen. In the first place, by absorbing the funds of Christians, as stated above, and requiring more ministers than are necesssary, were it not for these human creeds, the Gospel is hindered from being sent abroad.

In the next place, if you can *raise funds*, and *find men* to go, if they are of *different* sects, they must either lay aside their creeds, from the sight of the heathen, or be subjected to all the *drawbacks* and *hinderances* already mentioned, at home: and greater hinderances, too; because, the heathen must, and will, judge of the Gospel by the influence it has upon these missionaries; and if they see them divided, so that they *cannot walk together*, they must be led to doubt the reality and importance of a religion, professing to be a religion of *love*, which, as they suppose, inspires hostility among its votaries. If these missionaries do lay aside their creeds, on heathen shores, and labor together as brethren, in order that the cause may not be hindered, it is proof that these human creeds are not only *useless* but *pernicious;* and that men, while they have only *one* object in view, viz: the glory of God and the salvation of men, *practically* acknowledge *the fact* of their *pernicious influence*. Let them, then, be given to the "*moles and the bats*" along with all other "*idols*."

Once more—Suppose a missionary should go to a heathen land alone, and commence his labors by exhibiting, the prayer of our Lord, in the 17 chap. of John, together with his "new commandment," and the Saviour's testimony, that "all men" should *know* his disciples by their "love one to another." A heathen, who is jealous of any new religion, begins to inquire, whether Christians in America, are all *one*, and *do all love one another?* The *honest* missionary must tell the truth, or remain silent. If he remains silent, would it not throw a suspicion over him that would be likely to destroy confidence in his cause? But if he tells the truth, would not the astonished heathen naturally conclude his religion was a *deception?* That it does not accomplish what it professes? That its professed votaries, so far from being *one* and *loving one another*, are *tens*, yea *hundreds of parties?* And would he not say, "Go home and carry out the principles your Bible professes, and then it will be time enough for you to ask us to embrace your religion."

LETTER FROM BR. P. M. WAY.

The writer of the following letter is a minister of the Gospel, of the Methodist persuasion, with whom we have had many pleasing interviews, and under whose ministry we often sat in 1836–7, when residing in the city of Utica, N. Y. We shall append some remarks on the closing part of his letter, and hope he will favour us with a reply.

Br. Storrs.—"I have considered the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked, and believe I have gone deep into its investigation, and am frank to admit, if it be an error, it has more apparent support from the Bible than any error with which I am acquainted, and I probably should have embraced it as truth, had not light been thrown on my mind by reading some of the writings of Swedenborg. And yet I cannot adopt one peculiar sentiment of that author. I look upon his writings as the emanation of a great mind in ruins. Newman, in a little work on "Fascination," has probably given him a correct character. I confess to you, that, in my opinion, the character generally ascribed to God, as "A just God," dealing with sinners, by most preachers, is as dishonorable to God as the Alcoran is to our Lord Jesus Christ. I will merely say, without arguing the point, it appears plain to my mind, that it takes all of life to form a character for the future; and that character abides with us when probation ends. We may, or we may not, conform ourself to God's laws; and the result of either course is as certain as the laws of attraction. It is enough that "the reward of every man's hands shall be given him." To exclude the sinner from heaven is the best that God can do for him, and banishment from his revealed presence and glory is more tolerable than to dwell in its full blaze.

As it respects the unconscious state of the dead, between death and the resurrection, I am fairly at issue with your opinion. I need not say, perhaps, it is a pleasing hope that when this life of toil and suffering shall end, I expect to associate with my good brother Storrs, and all who love the Saviour, in scenes of blessedness, "Where we shall know as we are known," whilst the scenes of time are still being enacted, till earth's drama closes and Christ comes to reign. I readily call to my mind a number of passages that confirm this hope. "In my Father's house are many mansions. I go to prepare a place for you. Where I am there ye shall be also." "We know if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we *have* a building of God, eternal in the heavens." This hope inspires the suffering, toil-worn pilgrim with a "desire to depart and *be* with Christ, which is far better." Texts like the above, and there are not a few, establish the doctrine beyond a doubt, in my mind, and no criticism, that I have seen, has raised even a question. If so plain a truth must be denied to sustain another theory, it certainly throws doubt on that theory.

Yours for truth,
P. M. Way.

Syracuse, N. Y., July 15th, 1848.

Remarks on the Foregoing.

We certainly shall not quarrel with Br. Way, nor any one else, merely because he does not see as we do as to the state of the dead. We are glad to have him express his "issue" with us frankly. We would suggest, however, that to cut down a tree we must lay the axe at its roots. The root of the whole subject lies in this one question—"Is man immortal by creation, or generation?" If he is, then the texts Br. Way has presented are good and valid in proof of his consciousness when dead: but if he is not, then those texts must have some other application than that he gives them. The sense of these texts all turns on this point. To prove man immortal by creation or generation, we must have some plain Scripture testimony—*inference* cannot do it. Here, then, we join "issue" with all who dissent from our views, and affirm—There is not a solitary text in the Bible that affirms immortality of man, except as the gift of God at the resurrection; and then only given to those who by patient continuance in well doing *seek for* it. Compare Rom. 2: 7, with 1 Cor. 15: 16—18, 53, 54.

The first three chapters in Genesis establish on an immovable basis the fact that man was *not created immortal*. To threaten an immortal being with death would surely be a very great anomaly, if not a palpable contradiction. The term immortal signifies "*exempt from death:*" "*im*" signifying "*not;*" thus prefixed to "mortal" makes "not mortal," or "exempt from death." Such was not Adam by creation—such are none of his posterity by any law of their being. The plain declaration

of the scriptures of truth, with respect to Adam, after he sinned, is, that God excluded him from the tree of life "*lest* he take and eat of it and *live forever;*" or, become immortal in sin. Here the evidence is clear, that man was not immortal by his creation, or he would not need the tree of life to perpetuate his life; and it is equally clear that his Creator determined on the death of the man he had made without the exception of any part of him; or, in other words, he determined to reduce man to the elements from which he came; and as he was unconscious before creation, so at his death he became unconscious again; or else *Adam* did not die, and the serpent told the truth.

If this position is correct, then we need and must have, in order to *faith*, a *plain* revelation of the fact that man has an immortal part, if such is the fact. Will any man pretend that we have any such revelation? Tell us where it is to be found. We again affirm, as our conviction, it is no where in the Bible. If it is, those who are at issue with us can show it: and we will give them ample room in the Examiner to do so.

We will notice at this time only one of the texts presented to us by Br. Way, in proof that the dead are conscious, viz.: "In my Father's house are many mansions, I go to prepare a place for you. Where I am there ye shall be also." This text contains a delightful truth; and the only difference between Br. Way and ourself, on it, relates to *time*. The connection settles that. "If I go and prepare a place for you, I will COME AGAIN and receive you unto myself," &c. John 14: 3. Now the simple question is this—Does Christ *come again* at the death of his saints? To settle that point, we ask for a single text of Scripture that says so. But secondly. How did he *go away?* Was it *personally—bodily—visibly*, or otherwise? Let the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles forever settle that point. As he goes up, or went "away" he is *visible*, and the "white apparel" men, or angels, that appeared on that occasion, testified in accordance with our Lord's assurance in John 14th, quoted by Brother Way and ourself, "This SAME JESUS *shall so* COME in LIKE MANNER as ye have seen him *go* into heaven." Here, then, is the identical *coming again* of which Jesus spake: and it is not *at death;* for so he never did come at any man's death. Besides, it is clear, the disciples did not understand our Lord's promise of coming again to refer to death at all; for, when he said concerning John: "If I will that he tarry till I *come*, what is that to thee?" the disciples concluded, that, John "*should not die.*" But upon the common theory, had they believed it, they could not have come to any such conclusion.

The *time*, then, when Jesus will come again and receive his saints unto himself is, "at the last day," as may be clearly seen in John 6: 39, 40, 44, 54, where our Lord four times declares, concerning those to whom he will give eternal life, "I will raise him up at the last day;" that is *the time* when he "will come again and receive" his people unto himself, that where he is they may be also.

The fact that "it is a pleasing hope that when this life is" ended, we shall at once "associate with" our "good" brethren "in scenes of blessedness, whilst the scenes of time are still enacted, till earth's drama closes and Christ comes to reign," does not prove that such hope is well founded. The apostle presented another and a very different "hope" concerning Christians: 1 Thess. 4: 13. He there says: "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are ASLEEP, [not associating in scenes of blessedness] that ye sorrow not even as others which have NO HOPE." No hope of what? Clearly no hope of a resurrection, without which, he had declared, 1 Corth. 15: 18, they "are PERISHED," or would have no future life; making it all turn on the fact of a resurrection —that was the apostle's "pleasing hope;" as the next verse shows; "for," he says, "if we believe that Jesus *died* and rose again, even so them *also* which SLEEP in Jesus will God bring with him" from the dead; for, "the God of peace brought again *from the dead* our Lord Jesus." [See Heb. 13: 20.] But when shall this *hope* be realized, Paul? The answer is, when "the Lord HIMSELF shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God;" then "the dead in Christ," however long they have been asleep, "shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them* to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall be ever with the Lord. Wherefore, comfort one another with THESE WORDS." This is "the pleasing hope" that the Bible holds out to us; this is the glorious "association" to be realized when our Lord shall "COME AGAIN and receive" all his loving followers unto himself, that where he is there they may be also. Blessed day; glorious hope. Soon may that day arrive. All other hopes of being with Christ we consider delusive hopes. But, some perhaps will say, "If it is a delusion it is a blessed delusion." We answer, not so; for the common hope of professed Christians causes them to lose sight of two of the most glorious doctrines of the Bible—doctrines too, which the apostles dwelt upon more than any other, and which the present churches seem to think less of than any other, viz: THE SECOND PERSONAL ADVENT OF CHRIST, AND THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD. Any doctrine which puts these two great events in the back ground, or causes them to be looked at as of little importance, cannot be a "blessed delusion;" but the doctrine of man's natural immortality, and, by consequence, consciousness when dead, does obscure and eclipse these two grand events, and makes the coming of Christ and the resurrection of no apparent importance, and substitutes another hope, viz.: that of "going to heaven at death." But "the dead praise not the Lord." Psa. 115: 17; and "there is NO KNOWLEDGE in sheol"—the state of the dead. Eccl. 9: 10. All our hope, then, is in the coming again of Christ, at the last day, and the resurrection of the dead.

"TRUTH TESTED BY SCRIPTURE, *In Six Letters to a Friend.*"—We have received a copy of this work from the author, Br. A. B. Magruder, Charlottesville, Va. It is a very well arranged Scripture presentation of truth, on the end of the wicked and state of the dead. We hope it may be widely circulated. If we can find room we shall give extracts from it. It is a pamphlet of thirty-two pages, octavo. The price is not stated.

☞THE EDITOR of this paper preaches every Lord's day at COMMISSIONERS HALL, Third street, below Green, east side; at 10, A. M., and in the evening at a quarter before 8 o'clock.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, AUGUST, 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Bible.

CONTROVERSY.—Some men think controversy a dreadful matter, and should be avoided. Such a cry we regard as the offspring of bigotry and sectarianism. When individuals or associate bodies become determined not to make any further progress, controversy to them is a ruinous matter! What truth was ever elicited without controversy? None, except by direct revelation, and then it never spread without it. The whole life of our Saviour was one of facts and controversy; nor were the apostles less favored in that respect. Martin Luther and the Reformers had to travel the same road; the Pope was greatly offended with it, as all bigoted sectarians have been ever since, and always will be. Controversy is essential to progress in knowledge, and the developement of truth: but, the *spirit* in which it is often conducted is not essential. Let men guard their spirit, but never cease controversy. Lazy drones, who hate the labour necessary to progress, and those who fear the light, lest their bantling sect should be dissolved, may cry out against it, and glory that they "never change," and that they have not a new notion in their heads, but, he who would obey the divine injunction, to "grow in knowledge," must be wide awake to the work.

We are glad, in the discussion going on in the Examiner, between Br. Grew and Dr. Thomas, that we have two such able men engaged; and, especially so, that they are both believers in immersion as the only mode of baptism. It is not *the mode* of the ordinance that they discuss, but the *importance* of it. We have been repeatedly urged to give our views on the subject of baptism. We will do it in few words: "*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*" If we see a necessity to say more hereafter, we shall do so. If we can say nothing *new* we choose to keep silence. We are often astonished with the arguments some men use in advocating their peculiar views of the subject; but they satisfy their own minds, and we should not be likely to convince them of error. Dr. Thomas maintains that immersion is essential for admission into the kingdom of God, but that it is to be administered only to those who "*believe* the word of the truth of the Gospel." On the other hand, the "Christian Magazine," Nashville, Tenn., is just as strenuous for immersion as essential "*for* the remission of sins." The latter, probably, can tell us how sins committed after immersion are to be pardoned without being immersed again, or, how the "penitent thief" obtained "remission of sins;" and the former, doubtless, can tell us how the dying thief is to enter "Paradise," if such a case ever occurs; or, how any other dying "believer," whose circumstances have prevented his immersion, is ever to enter the kingdom of God. It took a *vision* to convince Peter, even "after the day of Pentecost," that all salvation was not confined to the Jews; but, he was convinced and made his confession—"Of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in *every nation* he that *feareth him, and worketh righteousness*, [according to the light he hath] is accepted with him." For, saith our Lord, "This is the condemnation, that *light* has come into the world, and men *loved* darkness rather than light, because *their deeds are evil.*" It is rejecting light, and sinning against it, from love to gain, applause, power, or sinful indulgences, that will be the condemnation of men at "the Judgment seat of Christ."

We suggest to Brethren Grew and Thomas, if they choose to continue the discussion, that they take up one of the topics at a time, embraced in their controversy; so as to shorten, if possible, their articles, but still freely and fully examining all the points, though it may take them longer to accomplish their object. We ought perhaps to have stated, at the time, that we took the liberty of inserting the index heads through Br. Thomas' last article. We think such heads give more interest to lengthy articles; especially where several topics are embraced.

"BORN OF WATER."—We have long since adopted the principle that where any doubt may arise as to the meaning of an expression uttered by our Lord, the safe course is, to inquire how the disciples understood it "after the day of Pentecost." Some affirm that a man must *actually* "hate his wife" to be a disciple of Christ; reasoning from Lk. 14: 26; while an apostle of Christ commands—"Husbands love your wives;" Eph. 5: 25. Our Lord says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." Some of his hearers understood this expression carnally, and thus committed a blunder that proved fatal to them, and caused them to forsake him wholly. The Saviour afterwards explains his words by saying—"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: *the words I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life.*"

Whatever may be said in favour of immersion, we are satisfied it is a total misapprehension of our Lord's words, John 3: 5, to apply them to *water baptism.* "Except a man be *born of water and the spirit* he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." But, "water does" *not* "mean spirit" here; but it

does mean that which purifies, cleanses, or sanctifies; for, "without *holiness* no man shall see the Lord;" or, shall "see the kingdom of God." Peter says: "Being *born again, not of corruptible seed,* [as they would be, if born of that "compound of oxygen and hydrogen upon which Noah's ark floated;" and *of* which, or *in* which they were actually born from their "mother's womb;" or when "born of the flesh;"] but of incorruptible, *by the* WORD OF GOD, which liveth and abideth forever;" 1 Peter 1: 23: therefore, as they are born again of this *word,* they *live forever,* or "enter the kingdom of God." Agreeably to this testimony of Peter, Paul declares that "Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that he might *sanctify and cleanse* it with the *washing of water* BY THE WORD:" Eph. 5: 25, 26. And both agree with our Lord who prayed to God, his Father—"*Sanctify* them through *thy truth,* THY WORD IS TRUTH;" John 17: 17. Thus we arrive at the certain conclusion, "in the mouth of three witnesses," that to be "born of water," *is* "*not* an emergence from that compound of oxygen and hydrogen upon which Noah's ark floated;" but, emerging from the love and practice of sin, in which men are held by ignorance and error, into the love and practice of holiness "by the word of God," or the *power of truth.* This is the first item in being born again; and is being born of water—*i. e.* "the word;" its completion will be in the resurrection of the dead, "at the last day," by "*the Spirit* of Him who raised up Jesus from the dead."

In the remarks on being "born of water," in the last Examiner, it is asked—"What does being born of anything consist in? Is it not an emergence from a place in which the subject was previously out of sight?" The writer adds—"If then earth be the matrix of which a thing is born, would not being born of earth, consist in coming up out of the ground in which the subject had been previously concealed? And doth the substitution of water for earth make any difference in the idea of birth?" He goes on to say—"To be born of water, then, is also to come up out of the water in which the person had been *deposited,* for there can be no emergence without previous *immersion.*"

We would just suggest, if this logic is good, then the other part of the text may be interpreted by the same rule and make sense. Let us test it by this principle. "What does being born of any thing consist in? Is it not an emergence from a place in which the subject was previously out of sight? If then the earth be the matrix of which a thing is born, would not being born of earth, consist in coming up out of the ground in which the subject had been previously concealed? And doth the substitution of" *Spirit* "for earth make any difference in the idea of birth? To be born of" *the Spirit,* "then, is to *come up out of the*" *Spirit* "in which the person had been *deposited,* for there can be no emergence without previous *immersion.*"

According to this logic the baptism of the Spirit, or being "born of the Spirit," is to emerge *from,* or *come up* OUT *of the Spirit.* The person was first "out of sight," *in* the Spirit; then he comes up out of it, and *he* is "born of the Spirit." While we do not believe our worthy brother, of whom we speak, is *thus* born of the Spirit, we fear many are. Alas, that many who "begin *in* the Spirit" should afterwards seem to think they "are made perfect by the flesh."

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.—Br. Walsh has not furnished No. 3 yet; but it will appear in our next. The only article we have from him, for this month, is "Dr. Tyng and the Truth." Our readers we know will regret that we have not more.

THE "GREAT EARTHQUAKE:" ANOTHER SHOCK.—The horrid slaughter in Paris, in the late attempt to overthrow the new government in France, seems to confirm the view we took of the late French Revolution, in the May number of the Examiner. Will our readers examine that article again? We are not disposed to take the *positive* ground some have taken on these convulsions. We have been of the opinion for three or four years past, that the seven last plagues, of Rev. 16th, were all to be poured out *before* the Advent, and that the *image,* Dan. 2d, was to be smitten and broken before. For these, and kindred views, we have received not a little abuse and scorn from certain would-be-orthodox "Adventists." No sooner do the very events begin to come to pass, which they did not believe would occur till *after* the advent, than they make the land ring with the proclamation that these events prove *they* have been right! even without waiting to see the result of these revolutions. It makes us think of the Catholic Priest who, in his funeral oration, declared that "Daniel O'Connell" was "in heaven looking down on the Irish people with deep sympathy;" and on the *next* Sunday said a mass "for the *release* of O'Connell's soul from purgatory!" The fact is, there are those who never say nor do wrong: or, what is worse, never *confess* when they have. So, after having denounced us because we could not work in their traces, they claim the very events that we looked for, and they did not, as proof that they were right!! We have only to say now, "Be patient, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh;" but still further shocks of the earthquake are to be realized, if, as we are still disposed to believe, the present convulsions are the "great earthquake," under the seventh vial. We beseech all to avoid undue excitement. We have need to keep our minds in peace,

trusting in God in these days of excitement. We cannot hurry the purposes of God, they will have their course; but we may hurry ourselves to destruction and ruin, by undue agitation. We need calm, sober reflection; with strict attention to the word and providence of God, and much prayer.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.—We give the following as one of the signs of the times, and as an important item in the "Peace and Safety" cry, which is immediately to precede the "Sudden Destruction" that "shall come upon" those that slight or despise the truth of God. Another remark we would make is—While God is about to do, or is doing, a great work, the agents of Satan will always try to get up an imitation. See the case of the magicians in Egypt that withstood Moses. But "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived" down to the very time of the second advent of the "King of kings." And because they hate the truth and love lies, "God shall send them strong delusions to believe a lie, that they all may be condemned who believe not the truth, but obey unrighteousness." The following "important prediction" combines some truths and some fatal errors. That there will be "a new state of society," soon, we fully believe: but that it will be the advent of Robert Owenism, instead of the advent of the King of kings, we do not believe. That "man is a creature of circumstances," to some extent, we freely admit: but that all those circumstances are "independent of his will" is a fatal and destroying error. Such a doctrine is the fruit of high Calvinism, and is fatalism; which is only another name for the atheistical doctrine—"*There is no God.*" When men come to years of understanding they can discover the difference between good and evil to some extent: and they are endowed by their Creator with the high attribute—*the power of choice.* Man does not "receive" all "his feelings and convictions independently of his will." To affirm he does is to abolish all distinction between right and wrong—good and evil: it is to convert man into a mere machine—a mere tool of fate—the sport of blind chance; it is to condemn all law—to abolish all order, it is to reduce the earth and its inhabitants to chaos, or to that confusion found in earth when it "was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." We may notice this subject more fully hereafter. Now for the wonderful "Prediction."

"IMPORTANT PREDICTION.—*A New State of Society in* 1900!!—'The year 1900 will find this world and its inhabitants in a state of *Perfection, Beauty, and Happiness never imagined.* ROBERT OWEN'S SYSTEM OF SOCIETY will then be *universal;* mankind will be united into one *harmonious brotherhood,* enjoying *health, happiness and long life.* The above system of Society is founded upon the FIVE FACTS OF NATURE which follow:—1st—MAN is a *compound being,* whose *character* is formed of his constitution or organization at birth, and of the *effects* of External Circumstances upon it from birth to death—such original organization and external influences continually acting and re-acting each upon the other. 2d—Man receives his feelings and convictions independently of his will. 3d—The feelings or the convictions, or both united, create the motive to action called the *will,* which stimulates him to act, and decides his actions. 4th—The organization of no two human beings is ever precisely similar at birth; nor can art form any two individuals, from infancy to maturity, to be precisely similar. 5th—The constitution of *every* infant, except in case of organic disease, *can* be formed into a VERY INFERIOR or a VERY SUPERIOR being, according to the circumstances allowed to influence that constitution from birth.

'A further analysis of the foundation of the above system is found below, consisting of TWO FACTS ONLY—1st, Man is the Creature of Circumstances; 2d, The *instinctive* desire for HAPPINESS is the only cause of *all* action. The System of Society by ROBERT OWEN, founded upon the above FACTS OF NATURE, is the only System which can confer upon the world HEALTH, HAPPINESS and LONG LIFE. *In the year* 1900, IT WILL! IT MUST!! IT SHALL!!! *be universal.* SAM SLEE.

May 1, *A. D.* 1848.

'☞ The reader will please *preserve* this paper for a curiosity, if for nothing else, and in 1860 compare it with the then existing State of Society. Again, compare it 1870, and again in 1880, observing the progress of the above system, and the downfall of all others."

REPLY TO QUESTIONS.

QUESTION 1. "What is the Sanctuary that is to be cleansed at the end of 2300 days, Daniel 8: 14?"

H. L. B.

ANSWER. We cannot now take up the question at length, but will say—It is clear to our mind the sanctuary is not *the church* nor *the whole earth,* as some have maintained. It is not the Church, or people of God, because a clear distinction is made in the text between "the sanctuary *and* the host." If the host is the people of God, it seems evident the sanctuary, or holy, is the asylum or place where God has specially promised to meet them and manifest his glory unto them; and that place was in the "holy land." If the prophet does not explain himself we shall look in vain to the fancies of men for an explanation. What does Daniel understand by the sanctuary? Hear him pray, chap. 9: 17; "Now therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy *sanctuary* that is desolate, for the Lord's sake." Does any one doubt but that Daniel means the House or Temple of God at Jerusalem? If he does, let him read on and see what Gabriel says, verse 26; "The people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the *sanctuary;*" and "he shall make it *desolate* [for ever? no; but] *until* the consummation, and that determined shall be *poured upon the desolator,*" [margin]: verse 27. Is there any just ground of doubt left as to *what sanctuary* is trodden under foot, and is to be made *clean*—justified, or vindicated, at the end of the 2300 days, or years?

QUES. 2. "Is Jerusalem that is to be trodden down of the Gentiles a place or People?"

ANS. Daniel 9th, which we have just quoted, states that "the city" is a subject of the judgments, or desolations, as well as the host. In Luke 21, our Lord is explicit in his statement, that "*the people* ["the host"] shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: AND *Jerusalem* ["the city" of Dan. 9] shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, [for ever? no, but] *until* the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Those "times," we think, are the 2300 years of Dan. 8th; and terminate when "that determined shall be poured upon the desolator:" and as Mahommedanism has been the last of the "abomin*ations*" that "overspread" Jerusalem, it is upon that power the *pouring* is to take place; and we are not left in doubt as to what was to be "*poured upon*" *this* "*desolator*." The 16th of Rev. settles that in our mind. It is the *sixth vial* of "the seven last plagues," which is to "dry up" that "overspreading abomination," by which it would be manifest that the 2300 years were ending, and God was cleansing the sanctuary, or "holy," as the Septuagint reads.

QUES. 3. "How long after the ending of the 2300 days to the Restitution, or new creation of the earth?"

ANS. We do not know; for we cannot tell how long from the ending of those days to the advent and personal reign of Christ. We believe Christ will reign, with his immortal saints, on this earth, the period, whatever it is, symbolized by "the thousand years," Rev. 20, after his advent and before the "new creation of the earth," if you mean the new heaven and new earth, Rev. 21. If, however, you mean by "the Restitution" the subjecting the world to his government, we believe that will *commence* at the advent; and that the future age, or thousand years dispensation, is allotted to putting "all things under" Christ, or *completing* the work of restitution; the last act of which will be the producing "a new heaven and a new earth:" then, and not before, will that saying be fulfilled, Rev. 21: 5, "Behold, I make all things new;" and God shall say—"IT IS DONE." v. 6.

QUES. 4. "Do you call all the time after Christ comes, to the cleansing of the world by fire, probation time?"

ANS. We see no evidence in the Scriptures to limit "probation time" to any period whatever. There is doubtless a limit of it, as it respects *individuals;* but to limit it in regard to the trial of some intelligent beings, we think, with present light, is a *mere assumption*, unwarranted by the Bible. "Of the INCREASE of his government and peace *there shall be no end* upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth [the time of his sitting on David's throne] *even for ever*." Isa. 9: 7.

QUES. 5. "When Christ comes to Mount Olivet have the saints been caught up?"

ANS. When Christ descends from heaven towards this earth, his *magnetic power*, if we may be allowed that expression, will act on all his friends alive or in their graves, with an attraction that may be illustrated by the magnet and the steel. As the two parties near each other the magnetic action will be so strong that the saints, or holy ones, whether alive, or asleep in their graves, cannot but rise to meet their coming Lord in the air. Or, we may illustrate this point by another figure. Some great personage, benefactor, or conqueror, approaches a city: all his friends, or as many as can, go out to meet him and escort him into the city, and give him a hearty welcome. Thus when Christ, our Lord and King, returns from heaven to take the throne of his father David and exercise his dominion from sea to sea, and from the river Euphrates, the border of David's kingdom, to the ends of the earth, the friends and lovers of Jesus will all go out to meet him, or be caught up to meet him in the air: not that he, or they are to remain there; but, he, still descending to earth, will come to Mount Olivet and "all his saints with him."

QUES. 6. "If there is probation after Christ comes, is HE the medium through which any will be saved?"

ANS. John 14: 6, "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." Acts 4: 12, "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." 1 Timothy 2: 5, "For *there is* one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

QUES. 7. "How can man be saved after Christ leaves the heavens?"

ANS. Much easier than now: for, all that love and make lies will be cut off in that day, so that there will be none left who corrupt the truth of God, nor any sectarians who corrupt men's minds for the sake of gain; and the watchmen will see eye to eye. But perhaps the question is asked with the thought that it is essential to salvation that Christ be in "the heavens." If so, we may ask—How were men saved while Christ was upon earth 1800 years ago? Surely he will have no less power to save when he returns. His power to save is not affected by his *location;* but so long as he *liveth* "he is able to save them to the *uttermost* that come unto God by him;" and this because, "he EVER liveth to make intercession for them:" and God "hath sworn and will not repent [change his mind] thou art a Priest FOR EVER after the order of Melchizedek;" Psa. 110: 4: and he is a "Priest after the power of *an endless life;*" Heb. 7: 16: "*He shall be a Priest upon* HIS *throne;*" Zech. 6: 13.

QUES. 8. "Are the saints on the earth while the wicked are being destroyed?"

ANS. Prov. 11: 31—"Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth:* much more the wicked and the sinner." Compare with Prov. 10: 30—"The righteous shall *never be removed:* but the wicked shall not inhabit the earth." See also Prov. 2: 21, 22—"For the upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect *shall remain in it.* But the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." Yes, "remain in it," and be no more harmed than the three Hebrews in Nebuchadnezzar's furnace; for, "the Son of God" will be with them, and the "smell of fire" will not be "found upon them."

RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

LUKE 16TH.—This portion of Scripture has been supposed to afford unanswerable proof that dead men are conscious, and that the wicked will be endlessly tormented. In whatever light it is viewed, it can prove nothing as to the *final* state of the sinner after the judgment; for the advocates of the

natural-immortal-soul theory maintain that the state of the rich man was that on which he entered immediately at death: If so, it was prior to the judgment, and consequently was not his punishment, unless God punishes men before he judges them. The state of the rich man before the judgment cannot therefore determine at all what his final state will be. This case, then, can only affect the question of man's state between death and the resurrection, which precedes the judgment.

This portion of Scripture is either a literal relation of facts, or it is a parable. Those who maintain that it is a literal relation, have no less difficulty in explaining it than their opponents: they cannot explain it all literally, and yet they are bound to do so to be consistent. Let them make the attempt. *Lazarus*, covered with sores, died and was carried *into* Abraham's *bosom*. Will they pretend that is literal? O, no, say they, it was Lazarus' *soul!* But our Lord says, *Lazarus* was carried into Abraham's bosom. Immortal soulists have to say—"*Not so, Lord*—it was his *soul*:" thus, they contradict our Lord to establish their "own traditions." Let us see whether they succeed any better with their "real history" of the rich man. He died. What became of him? He "was buried:" the *rich man* was buried, remember. What next? "In [*hades, the grave*, of course, where he was buried; improperly translated] hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom," &c. *The rich man* did this. Immortal-soulists say—It was his *soul:* but our Lord says, it was the rich man. Thus again they make void the words of Christ to establish their traditions, if our Lord did really give a "literal history." But for the sake of showing the folly of their tradition about the soul, we will let them have it that it was Lazarus' and the rich man's souls or spirits, disembodied, that are in hades. We now ask—Are their disembodied souls or spirits material or immaterial? That is, are they matter, or not matter? We are answered—"They are immaterial." If so, they have *no substance!* Can that which has no substance be seen or touched? If they have no substance, they are nothing. So, the "literal history" advocates have an immaterial rich man, with immaterial eyes, looking afar off and seeing immaterial Lazarus, or no-substance Lazarus! Truly, these immaterial souls must have sharp eyes to see *nothing!* and an equally sharp understanding to know that nothing is Lazarus! But this is not all. The immaterial (nothing) rich man desires that immaterial Lazarus should dip his immaterial finger in literal water and cool his immaterial tongue! And all this is "literal history"!! We have not placed the subject in this absurd position with any other view than merely to show the "literal history" advocates that they are, at least, as much involved in difficulty in explaining this scripture as we, who believe it to be a parable, and that it has no reference to man's state in a future life.

That it is a parable, the context shows. It is in a group of them, viz., the lost piece of silver—the lost sheep—the prodigal son, and the wasteful or "unjust steward," with an admonition against serving mammon, or riches. The Pharisees, who were covetous, heard all these things, and they derided him. Our Lord then proceeds in his discourse with special reference to the change about to take place in the dispensations. He says—"The law and the prophets were [preached] until John; since that time the Kingdom of God is preached," &c. Before proceeding to an explanation of this Scripture, we will present the remarks and admissions of eminent men, who have been considered orthodox, relating to its being a parable.

LIGHTFOOT. "Whoever believes this not to be a parable, but a true story, let him believe also those little friars, whose trade it is to show the monuments at Jerusalem to pilgrims, and point exactly to the place where the house of the 'rich glutton' stood. Most accurate keepers of antiquity indeed! who, after so many hundreds of years, such overthrows of Jerusalem, such devastations and changes, can rake out of the rubbish the place of so private a house, and such a one too, that never had any being, but merely in parable. And that it was a parable, not only the consent of all expositors may assure us, but the thing itself speaks it.

"The main scope and design of it seems this—to hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews, who, though they had Moses and the prophets, did not believe them—nay, would not believe, though one (even Jesus) arose from the dead. For that conclusion of the parable abundantly evidenceth what it aimed at: *If they hear not Moses and the prophets, &c.*"—*Heb. and Talm. Exerc. in Luke* xvi. 19.

WHITBY. "That this is only a parable, and not a real history of what was actually done, is evident: 1. Because we find this very parable in the *Gemara Babylonicum*, whence it is cited by Mr. Sheringham, in the preface to his *Joma*. 2. From the circumstances of it, viz., the rich man's *lifting up his eyes in hell, and seeing Lazarus in Abraham's bosom*, his discourse with Abraham, his complaint of being *tormented with flames*, and his desire that Lazarus might be sent to *to cool his tongue;* and if all this be confessedly *parable*, why should the rest, which is the very parable in the Gemara, be accounted history?" *Annot. in loc.*

WAKEFIELD. Ver 23, "*In the grave; en to hade:* and, comformably to this representation, he is spoken of as having a *body*, ver. 24. It must be remembered, that *hades* nowhere means *hell—gehenna*—in any author whatsoever, *sacred* or *profane;* and also, that our Lord is giving his hearers a parable, (Matt. xiii. 34,) and not a piece of *real history*. To them who regard the narration as a *reality*, it must stand as an unanswerable argument for the *purgatory* of the *papists*. The universal meaning of *hades* is *the state of death;* because the term *sepulchrum* or *grave*, is not strictly applicable to such as have been consumed by *fire*, &c. See ver. 30." *Note in loc.*

Dr. Adam Clarke remarks on Matt. 5: 26—"Let it be remembered, that by the general consent of all, (except the basely interested,) no *metaphor* is ever to be *produced* in proof of a doctrine. In the things that concern our eternal salvation, we need the most *pointed and express evidence* on which to establish the faith of our souls." Bishop Louth says—"Parable is that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of *fictitious* or accommodated events, applied to the illustration of some important truth."

We state it then as a principle, that no parable is to be used as teaching doctrine not elsewhere explicitly revealed. Parables are used only to illustrate some truth already known, or partially so, or to prepare the way to present a truth not yet

fully developed, but
explicit instruction.
parable is what we
the truth of God by t
is a *reality* that "ha
that every item in it
application to the su
trate. By such ass
thrown on revelatio
verted into food for
have turned to "c
any doubt whether
purely *fictitious*, let
eagles' cropping th
parable of the "ewe
the parable of the
9: 7—15. It is said t
for he sees, feels a
common among the
without life as kno
see Gen. 4: 10; Hab
Prov. 8: 1—3; Prov.
was in no danger
parable, as teachin
men, and especiall
expressly taught, "t
that "their thought
die—that, "the dea
that, "there is *no k*
men go: and furthe
expression in Greek
man after death, tha
Hebrew *sheol*, viz.,
in no other way than
like that to which w
the Old Testament
subject to his deri
before giving our p
present explanation
men, whose "orthod
state of the dead is
this parable goes to
have a different in
given. The first au
two-fold application
apply to the tormen
or to calamities tha
this world. He say
"*The rich man die*
of the political an
Jewish people, whic
city of Jerusalem, a
abolition of the tem
ceremonial law: a
church state, and th
them was broken;
them, which was as
their call by it, will
well as their place a
authority were tak
Romans, and a dea
and calamities of ev
ever since.'
"*In hell—in torm*
vengeance of God o
of Jerusalem, when
land, and burned to
the earth with her
foundations of the m
became brimstone,
were rooted out of

fully developed, but about to be, either by facts or explicit instruction. The *scope* or design of the parable is what we are to seek, and not pervert the truth of God by the *assumption* that the parable is a *reality* that "has been or may be:" nor, yet, that every item in it was ever designed to have an application to the subject it was intended to illustrate. By such assumptions discredit has been thrown on revelation, the truth of God been converted into food for the most fanatical, and men have turned to "cunningly devised fables." If any doubt whether parables are not sometimes purely *fictitious*, let them read the parable of the eagles' cropping the cedar, Ezk. 17: 1—10; the parable of the "ewe lamb," 2 Saml. 12: 1—7; and the parable of the trees choosing a king, Judges, 9: 7—15. It is said the rich man must be conscious, for he sees, feels and talks. We reply—It was common among the Hebrews to represent things without life as knowing, feeling and conversing: see Gen. 4: 10; Hab. 2: 11; Isa. 14: 8; Psa. 93: 3; Prov. 8: 1—3; Prov. 9: 1—5, &c. Our Lord, then, was in no danger of being understood, in this parable, as teaching the consciousness of dead men, and especially, as the Hebrew scriptures expressly taught, "the dead praise not the Lord"—that "their thoughts perish in the very day" they die—that, "the dead know not anything"—and that, "there is *no knowledge* in *sheol*," where dead men go: and further, inasmuch as Jesus uses the expression in Greek, to show the state of the rich man after death, that exactly corresponds with the Hebrew *sheol*, viz., *hades*, he could be understood in no other way than as using a fabulous discourse, like that to which we have previously referred in the Old Testament, to illustrate an unpalatable subject to his deriding hearers. We will now, before giving our present view of this parable, present explanations and admissions of eminent men, whose "orthodoxy" in regard to the conscious state of the dead is undoubted, yet their view of this parable goes to show that they suppose it may have a different interpretation from that usually given. The first author is Dr. Gill, who makes a two-fold application of it, and supposes it may apply to the torment of wicked Jews after death, or to calamities that were to come upon them in this world. He says:

"*The rich man died:* 'It may also be understood of the political and ecclesiastical death of the Jewish people, which lay in the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, and of the temple, and in the abolition of the temple worship, and of the whole ceremonial law: a *Loammi* was written upon their church state, and the covenant between God and them was broken; the gospel was removed from them, which was as death, as the return of it, and their call by it, will be as life from the dead; as well as their place and nation, their civil power and authority were taken away from them by the Romans, and a death of afflictions, by captivity and calamities of every kind, have attended them ever since.'

"*In hell—in torments*: 'This may regard the vengeance of God on the Jews, at the destruction of Jerusalem, when a fire was kindled against their land, and burned to the lowest hell, and consumed the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains; and the whole land became brimstone, salt, and burning; and they were rooted out of it in anger, wrath, and great indignation—see Deut. xxix. 23, 27, 28, xxxii. 22—or rather the dreadful calamities which came upon them in the times of Adrian, at Bither; when their false messiah, Bar Cochab, was taken and slain, and such multitudes of them were destroyed, in the most miserable manner, when that people, who before had their eyes darkened, and a spirit of slumber and stupidity fallen upon them, in those calamities began to be under some convictions.'" *Expos. in loc.*

Theophylact.—This ancient writer first applies the parable to the concerns of the next life. He then says:

"But this parable can also be explained in the way of allegory; so that we may say, that by the rich man is signified the Jewish people; for they were formerly rich, abounding in all divine knowledge, wisdom, and instruction, which are more excellent than gold or precious stones. And they were arrayed in purple and fine linen, as they possessed a kingdom and a priesthood, and were themselves a royal priesthood to God. The purple denoted their kingdom, and the fine linen their priesthood; for the Levites were clothed in sacerdotal vestments of fine linen, and they fed sumptuously, and lived splendidly, every day. Daily did they offer the morning and the evening sacrifice, which they also called the continual sacrifice. But Lazarus was the Gentile people, poor in divine grace and wisdom, and lying before the gates; for it was not permitted to the Gentiles to enter the house itself, because they were considered a pollution. Thus, in the Acts of the Apostles, we read that it was alleged against Paul, that he had introduced Gentiles into the temple, and made that holy place common or unclean. Moreover, those people were full of fetid sores of sin, on which the impudent dogs, or devils, fed, who delight themselves in our sores. The Gentiles likewise desired even the crumbs which fell from the tables of the rich; for they were wholly destitute of that bread which strengthens the heart of man, and wanted even the smallest morsel of food; so that the Canaanite woman, (Matt. xv. 27,) when she was a heathen, desired to be fed with the crumbs. In short, the Hebrew people were dead unto God, and their bones, which could not be moved to do good, were perished. Lazarus also (I mean the Gentile people,) was dead in sin, and the envious Jews, who were dead in sins, did actually burn in a flame of jealousy, as saith the Apostle, on account of the Gentiles being received into the faith, and because that those who had before been a poor and despised Gentile race, were now in the bosom of Abraham, the father of nations, and justly, indeed, were they thus received. For it was while Abraham was yet a Gentile, that he believed God, and turned from the worship of idols to the knowledge of God. Therefore, it was proper that they who were partakers of this conversion and faith, should rest in his bosom, sharing the same final lot, the same habitation, and the same blessedness. And the Jewish people longed for one drop of the former legal sprinklings and purifications, to refresh their tongue, that they might confidently say to us, that the law was still efficacious and availing. But it was not; for the law was only until John. And the Psalmist says, sacrifice and oblations thou wouldst not, &c." *Annot. in loc.*

James Bate, M. A., Rector of Delford, says:—"We will suppose, then, the *rich man who fared so*

sumptuously, to be the Jew, so amply enriched with the heavenly treasure of divine revelation. *The poor beggar who lay at his gate*, in so miserable a plight, was the poor Gentile, now reduced to the last degree of want, in regard to religious knowledge. *The crumbs which fell from the rich man's table*, and which the beggar was *so desirous of picking up*, were such fragments of patriarchal and Jewish traditions, as their travelling philosophers were able to pick up with their utmost care and diligence. And those philosophers were also the *dogs that licked the sores* of heathenism, and endeavored to supply the wants of divine revelation, by such schemes and hypotheses, concerning the nature of the gods, and the obligation of moral duties, as (due allowance for their ignorance and frailties) did no small honor to human nature, and yet thereby plainly showed, how little a way unassisted reason could go, without some supernatural help, as one of the wisest of them frankly confessed. About one and the same time, *the beggar dies, and is carried by the Angels* (i. e., God's spiritual messengers to mankind,) *into Abraham' bosom;* that is, he is engrafted into the church of God. *And the rich man also dies and is buried.* He dies what we call a political death. His dispensation ceases. He is rejected from being any longer the peculiar son of God. The people whom he parabolically represents, are miserably destroyed by the Romans, and the wretched remains of them, driven into exile over the face of the earth, were vagabonds, with a kind of mark set upon them, like Cain, their prototype, for a like crime; and which mark may perhaps be their adherence to the law. Whereby it came amazingly to pass, that these people, though dispersed, yet still dwell alone and separate, *not being reckoned among the nations*, as Balaam foretold. The rich man being reduced to this state of misery, complains bitterly of his hard fate, but is told by Abraham, that he slipped his opportunity, while Lazarus laid hold on his, and now receives the comfort of it. The Jew complains of the want of more evidence, to convince his countrymen, the five brethren, and would fain have Lazarus sent from the dead to convert him. But Abraham tells him, *that if their own scriptures cannot convince them of their error, neither would they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.* And exactly so it proved in the event. For this parable was delivered towards the end of the third year of our Lord's ministry; and in the fourth, or following year of it, the words put into the mouth of Abraham, as the conclusion of the parable, are most literally verified, by our Lord's raising another Lazarus from the dead. And we may presume, that the beggar had the fictitious name of Lazarus given him in the parable, not without some reason, since the supposed request of the rich man was fully answered, by our Lord's raising another, and a real Lazarus, from the dead. But what was the consequence? Did this *notorious* miracle convince the rich man's brethren? No, truly. His visit to them from the dead was so far from convincing them, that they actually *consulted together, that they might put Lazarus also to death; because that, by reason of him, many of the Jews went away and believed on Jesus.* So much for the true sense of this parable."

After such testimony, we trust we shall not incur the censure of heresy if we state our conviction of the true intent and scope of this parable. The context shows that our Lord's design was to illustrate the effect upon two classes of men that would result from the change of dispensation from the law of Moses to the gospel of grace, now to be fully preached to all nations, which new dispensation was "the mystery, which in other *ages* [or, dispensations] was not made known unto the sons of men;" but, being now about to be "revealed unto holy apostles," would change the condition of both Jews and Gentiles; which change is aptly represented by the figure, death, in the parable: as the state and condition of both parties would be entirely changed. Let the reader please turn to the chapter, and see how our Lord introduces this parable. After having spoken of the law and the prophets being preached until John, and that since that time the kingdom of God was preached, he intimates that the law was about to have its last and perfect accomplishment—that the last "tittle" of it was about to be "finished:" that then the Jews would be like the wife whose husband was dead, the law not binding them any longer; and that God, who had dealt with them under the title of husband, would be at full liberty to select a new bride out of all nations. Thus Paul reasons, Rom. 7: 1—4. "Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then, if while her husband liveth she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress: but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God." Now read the verse with which the parable of the rich man is introduced, Luke 16: 18. "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery." So long as the law given by Moses continued, the Jews were chargeable with adultery if they lacked in fidelity to that law as unto God their husband; but nationally they had often been wanting in fidelity, and the law was no longer to be the marriage contract; a new covenant, ratified by the blood of Christ, and not by the blood of bulls or goats, was to form the ground by which the new bride was to hold her relationship to God, and through which she was to receive the blessings promised. The law being dead "by the body," or death, "of Christ," still to cleave to that law, as the Jew did, was to commit adultery, and bring upon themselves all its curses: they died unto Christ, by rejecting him and putting him to death, and "were broken off" from Abraham's bosom, or from all spiritual connection with him, and have been in "*torments*" unto this day in consequence: while the believing soul, who received Christ, even though he had been a polluted Gentile, "full of sores, died" unto the law [see Rom. 7: 4] and was grafted into the good "olive tree," or was translated through the instrumentality of angels [messengers, or ministers of Christ] "into Abraham's bosom," became a child of Abraham and an heir, according to the promise, to the king-

dom of God. The Jews, as a nation, had their "good things" in their "life time," or while they held the relation of bride to their Maker; but now being dead, nationally, in reference to that relation they are tormented, grievously and sorely tormented; and all their appeals, as to their relation to Abraham, have proved unavailing; and it has added not a little to their torment and sorrow to see the Gentiles enjoying rich blessings from which they find themselves shut out. We speak, of course, particularly of social, civil, and political blessing, in which they possessed "much" advantage "every way," in the days of their national prosperity. But an impassable gulf exists between them and the Gentiles now: but even that is no where said to be eternal. It will indeed continue to the end of this age, or dispensation; or till the Redeemer returns to Zion. Till that time there will be no *national* repentance; but, then will be fulfilled the prophecy of Zech. 12: 10—14.

The Jews, as a nation, hitherto have professed that their rejection of Jesus as the promised Messiah was want of evidence; like the rich man, in the parable, they have constantly cried, from the days of Jesus, for more evidence. "Let him come down from the cross and we will believe." But when he "ROSE from the dead," as the rich man is represented as desiring one to do, to convince the unrepenting Jews, instead of repentance being produced in them, as a nation, they put to death the witnesses of that glorious event. Who can contemplate the untold sufferings of that nation from the time Jerusalem was compassed about with armies, and their city destroyed, to the present generation, and not discover the propriety of the parable our Lord employed to illustrate those torments and their hopeless state? Surely we have in this view a full explanation of the parable.

LETTERS.

BR. E. HOYT, Farmington, Mich., writes :—

BR. STORRS:—The doctrine of Redemption from literal death, or of dead men from the dust of the earth, and the destruction of the wicked by the second death, in the lake of fire, is fast spreading in this State. Nearly all who have been looking for the Lord, for a few years past, believe the doctrine, and others are beginning to adopt it. I have lately attended two conferences in Indiana, and one just through, twenty miles west from Detroit. In both meetings the sleep of the dead and perdition of the wicked was held forth with power. Several believers were baptized for the remission of sins and the resurrection of the dead. There is seen to be a beautiful harmony of the doctrines of the Bible in this view of the penalty of the first sin; and it makes the resurrection, as the Bible does, our only hope of immortality and eternal life.

BR. H. ALLEN, Mogadore, Ohio, writes :—

BR. STORRS:—Having had an opportunity to peruse the "Bible Examiner," and being willing to learn from any and every source, we have concluded to take the *last numbers* of the present volume, and longer, should you continue publishing. There are a number here who believe that life and immortality are the attributes of the Kingdom of God; the reward of the saints which they will receive at the resurrection.

We have those also who advocate the heathen dogma, that man has an immortal soul, *a part* of God, which is to enjoy happiness or endure misery throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity. Yes! that a part of God is to be eternally scorched in hell!! How wonderfully absurd.

Yours, in hope of immortality and eternal life.

BR. J. B. TYLER, Lackawack, N. Y., writes :—

BR. STORRS:—I send enclosed subscription money for the Bible Examiner, which I have received regular; and for four years past I have met no religious paper so interesting to me as the Examiner. It is good ground to be on to walk by faith in present views, and convictions of duty, rather than to claim that past views and character must sanctify and make perfect the present and future. We should be daily learners. I read the * * * * and * * * * weekly, and I have an interest in them; but it is often, very often, I am grieved and wounded by the manifestations of exclusiveness there. All social and religious bodies, whether good or bad, love their own and have some way to show it. Why don't we take the one step from morality alone to Christianity, and love all for Christ's sake? For one, I want to be Christ-like as far as I may be.

BR. HENRY E. CARVER, Cincinnati, Ohio, writes :—

BR. STORRS:—I believe that we are living in the period of the world's history, when we may reasonably expect the speedy establishment of God's everlasting kingdom under the whole heavens. My reasons for this belief are partly as follows:—In the prophecy of David, under the symbols of the four divisions of the image, and also the four beasts, we have presented to our vision the ENTIRE reign of Gentile kingdoms, or power; reaching from the time of Babylon to the setting up of the Kingdom of God; and, consequently, we must be living somewhere in the range of the prophecy referred to above. Where are we in the prophetic history? In the head of the image or the first beast? No—it is numbered with the things that were. In the second or third succeeding powers? No—they also are past. Then where are we? In the fourth and *last* division of the image, or under the dominion of the fourth and *last* "dreadful and terrible beast;" even that beast that had the "little horn," that had eyes and a mouth speaking great things. But in what part of the last universal monarchy are we? Not in the legs, nor simply in the feet, but in the very *toes* of the image—in the very part that will first be demolished by the "stone" kingdom. Daniel, in describing the last earthly kingdom as symbolized by the terrible beast, brings us down through its successive changes until he sees the "little horn" arise, and then says: *I beheld till the thrones were cast down.* This is the last event here mentioned prior to the sitting of Judgment, and who that will duly consider the present condition of the different parts of the last great kingdom, but will be constrained to say: this is that spoken by the prophet Daniel, "I beheld till the thrones were cast down:" and as the judgment is mentioned next in order and connection, the conclusion is inevitable, that the second advent of the Son of God is at hand.

Looking at the signs given by the blessed Jesus, to tell us when his kingdom was nigh at hand, we are forced to the same conclusion.

My soul magnifies the Lord for what I have

learned since the notes of the "angel having the everlasting gospel to preach," began to swell upon the breeze, and came floating in cheering and life-giving strains over the mountains. Many things have I learned concerning the "faith once given to the Saints"—truths that had been obscured and almost obliterated by contact with sectarian interpretation, have been rescued from their situation, cleansed of their unseemly traditions, by the washing of water by the word, and now present themselves as glorious gems in that girdle of *truth* worn by every Bible Christian. Let us see to it that we have on this girdle, and bind it closely round our minds, having on the *whole* armor and our lamp in our hand, our light burning, and we *waiting for our Lord*, that when He shall descend from heaven with a shout, &c., we may be caught up to meet and ever be with him. Amen, even so, come Lord Jesus.

—

Br. R. E. Ladd, Conway, Mass., writes :—

Br. Storrs:—You perceive by the head of this that I have removed from my former abode. I have been here several months, and have a noble field for labor. My soul is absorbed in the subject of Life and Immortality through Jesus Christ; and I present the "word of God" on this subject, in every place, and on all proper occasions; and I am certain that within the circle of my acquaintance it is becoming more and more interesting; prejudice is removing and light is appearing as the day is approaching.

I am exceedingly edified and instructed by the Examiner, and hail its monthly coming with intense solicitude, and only regret it could not appear semi-monthly, or weekly. If I had the means of my own it *should* be so. I shall try to obtain fifty good paying subscribers for the present volume. Not one of my subscribers, who take the Examiner, wish it discontinued, and I cannot say as much of any other advent paper for which I have ever felt an interest. May God speed you in your efforts to spread light and truth on the most momentous subject the Bible contains.

Br. Ladd has already forwarded us between thirty and forty names for the present volume of the Examiner, and still is sending more. Among five hundred new subscribers, we have received for the present volume, we believe there has not been an individual who has requested a discontinuance; and among old subscribers not more than two or three; and all new subscribers, with two exceptions, have ordered the Examiner from the commencement of the present volume. We can accept no new subscribers upon any other conditions, so long as we can supply the entire volume.—Ed. Ex.

—

Br. D. B. Eldred, Homer, Mich., writes :—

Br. Storrs:—I was not able to attend the meeting at Nankin, that I spoke of in my former letter; but Br. E. Miller gave me an account of it. A goodly number assembled, and the disciples, except a very few, have embraced the Bible view of Life and Death; as also the record God hath given of *His Son*. By means of the "Six Sermons," and the labors of Br. Seymor and wife, with God's blessing, some five or six families have fully embraced the faith. Several others were "pricked in their hearts." Br. Miller exhorted them to "repent and be baptized every one of them." Several came forward and were baptized. My prayer is that they may remain steadfast. The cause, every where that I can hear from in this region, is steadily on the gain. I had a visit a short time since with my brother-in-law, to whom I sent the "Six Sermons," mentioned in my last letter. He is now rejoicing in hope of eternal life at the restitution. Could you be present at some of the meetings on Br. Miller's circuit, and hear the brethren giving praise and glory to God for sending Br. Storrs' Sermons as an agent to open the eyes of their understanding, it would do you good. But some of the D. D.'s are cursing you for what they call infidelity.

But, "Blessed are ye, when men shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for Christ's sake." Go on, brother, in the strength of Israel's God. The battle will soon be over. The Roman kingdom is fast ripening for destruction. Yours, in hope of eternal glory.

—

Br N. A. Hitchcock, Tyler, Ill., writes :—

Br. Storrs:—Since I wrote you, and received the papers and sermons, I have learned that the truth which they contain is accomplishing some good, for which I rejoice; for none of us should, and no amiable heart can be indifferent with regard to what is vice and virtue, or truth and error. It appears to me written in burning letters, that man is a mortal, dying creature; that the punishment due to sin is death; and the only security against it is to put on Christ—become new creatures. By maintaining this state, or character unto the end, we shall, if sleeping, be "raised up at the last day," or if living, be changed to live forever; and we then put on an immortal and incorruptible nature, like Christ, to die no more. The hope of this glorious state saves us even now, "For we are saved by hope." Rom. 8: 24. And the excellency of the power of this hope is to save us as the anchor saves the vessel from wreck while encountering a mighty storm; and we have, as a pledge, that the storm will end, and that mortality will be swallowed up of life.

—

Br. Elon Everts, writes from New Haven, Vt. :

Br. Storrs:—I find the "Bible Examiner" to be what it purports to be; not that I would be understood that it may not err in some points, or at least not yet fully attained to the full light; for had it, I ought to be content with the past numbers; but, believing that light is sown for the righteous, and that it will illuminate the path of the Christian more and more to their journey's end; therefore, my feeble voice is, may God imbue the hearts of all that speak through its columns with love, and that spirit that leads into all truth.

I wish to remember and obey the sayings of Jesus, to lend, even if there is no prospect of receiving again. I see many who are spell-bound with the iron bands of human creeds, cruel tradition and stupidity, hardly believing that God will do good or bring evil. I think the influence of the "Examiner" is to melt down those barriers, that have swelled to mountains, to oppose the truth. This induces me to hope to do some good by "lending" it. I dislike to be destitute of it, therefore I send you $3.00; send me as many copies as you please. I think the Examiner is doing a work that no other paper in America can do.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, SEPTEMBER, 1848. No. 9.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY:

OR, THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN IN RELATION TO IMMORTALITY AND ETERNAL LIFE.

BY J. T. WALSH.

No. III.

MENTAL DISEASE AND DEATH.

In our last article on the constitution of man, we promised to take up the subject of *Mental Diseases*, and to apply our reasonings on the subject to the doctrine of immortality and eternal life; and we now proceed to the execution of the work.

1. Let the reader remember the position of our opponents that, *when the man is dead, and his brain resolved into dust, he still thinks and feels.*

OUR INFERENCE, OR DEDUCTION: *If the above be true,* NO DISEASE OR INJURY OF THE BRAIN SHOULD INTERRUPT THE MANIFESTATIONS OF THE MIND.

But disease and accidents do destroy the manifestations of the mind; and now for the proof:

2. A number of persons are born idiots, and never manifest any mind at all. Why is this, if the mind—the intellect, be independent of *cerebral organization?* If men can think and reason without any brain, (that is, when they are dead,) what should hinder them from thinking with an *imperfect brain?* And if they cannot reason with an *idiotic* or imperfect brain, how are they to do so *without any brain at all?*

3. Again:—In childhood, the mind is as feeble as the body; in youth we find that, as the physical powers are developed, expanded and enlarged, so are the mental; and when manhood arrives, we discover those gigantic intellectual faculties, which are the combined result of a sound, well matured, and well developed organization and education.—In childhood, we behold these faculties in an embryo state. We see them gradually unfolding, like the rose, up through youth, until manhood presents us with a *full blown* intellect, all fragrant with wisdom and knowledge! But in old age, the mind is again as feeble as the body. The whole system, including the brain, becomes shrunk and enfeebled—the limbs totter, and fancy's fires decay.

Why is this, if the mind be immortal? If this were so, should not the mind be as strong, as brilliant, and as profound in childhood and old age, as in the prime of manhood? Upon the hypothesis, that it is immortal, it certainly should.

4. Even the state of the atmosphere will affect the mind, either *elevating* or *depressing* it. Is an immortal mind subject to atmospheric changes?

5. When the *body* is diseased, *weakness* and *imbecility* of mind are the consequences. What then must be the consequence when the *body is dead?* Let revelation answer: "In that very day their thoughts perish."

6. When the skull is fractured and pressure is made upon the brain, all consciousness is suspended; while no such phenomena takes place with any other organ. We will state a few cases in proof of this subject. M. Richerand had a patient whose brain was exposed in consequence of disease of the skull. One day, in washing off the purulent matter, he chanced to press with more than usual force, and instantly the patient, who, the moment before, had answered his questions with perfect correctness, stopped short in the middle of a sentence, and became altogether *insensible.* As the pressure gave her no pain, it was repeated thrice, and always with the same result. She uniformly recovered her faculties the moment the pressure was taken off. He, also, mentions the case of an individual who was trepanned for a fracture of the skull, and whose FACULTIES and CONSCIOUSNESS became weak in proportion as the *pus* so accumulated under the dressings as to occasion pressure of the brain.

A man at the battle of Waterloo had a small portion of his skull beaten in upon the brain, and became unconscious, and almost lifeless. But Mr. Cooper having raised up the depressed portion of the bone, the patient immediately arose, dressed himself, became perfectly rational, and recovered rapidly. Professor Chapman, of Philadelphia, mentions in his Lectures, that he saw an individual with his skull perforated and the brain exposed, who used to submit himself to the same experiment of pressure as that performed on Richerand's patient, and who was exhibited by the late Professor Wistar to his class. The man's intellect and moral faculties disappeared when pressure was applied to the brain: they were literally held under the thumb, and could be restored at pleasure to their full activity. A still more remarkable case is that of a person named Jones, recorded by Sir Astly Cooper. Jones was deprived of consciousness, by being wounded in the head while on board a vessel in the Mediterranean Sea. In this state of insensibility he remained for several months in Gibraltar, whence he was transmitted to Deptford, and subsequently to St. Thomas's Hospital, London. Mr. Cline the Surgeon, found a portion of the skull depressed, trepanned him, and removed the depressed portion of the bone. Three hours after the operation, he sat up in bed, sensation and volition returned, and in four days he was enabled to get up and converse. The last circumstance he remembered, was the capture of a prize in the Mediterranean thirteen months before.

Will any Christian, or Christian Philosopher, reconcile these phenomena with consciousness *in*, and *after*, death? If thought and consciousness can be suspended by pressure on the brain, during life, what becomes of thought and consciousness after death? Are they in full exercise? Let the Bible answer: "The dead know not any thing."

7. In a swoon, blood is rapidly withdrawn from the brain, and total *unconsciousness* is the result. This should not be the case, if the mind were immortal.

8. The phenomena of *sleep* furnish another proof that mind is developed by the *cerebrum*. In profound sleep all consciousness is suspended, which is incompatible with the idea of the mind being altogether independent of the brain; for we cannot conceive of an immaterial principle asleep and unconscious.

9. To sum up all the diseased states of the mind during life, we would ask, how are they compatible with the possession of an incorruptible and deathless mind? Only upon the hypothesis that the intellectual powers are *totally independent of the immortal soul*? And if all the intellectual powers are independent of the immortal soul, and thus become subject to disease, *what is the soul which is left*? A perfect *blank*—A NONENTITY.

10. But *death* closes the scene: "In *death*," says David, "*there* IS NO REMEMBRANCE OF THEE!" "In *sheol* who shall give thee thanks?" None! No, not one!!

"BORN OF WATER."

However others may differ on the subject of being born of water, to me it is clear that it has not the most remote allusion to our *natural birth*. In the 1st chapter of John the natural birth is spoken of as the product of the "*will* of man, the will (or lust) of the flesh," and "*of blood*." And, hence, in the conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus said to him, "*That which is born of the flesh* IS FLESH." That is, it is like its origin—*fleshly*—*not* SPIRITUAL. Thus, "The first man was of the earth —*earthy*"—animal, fleshly. NICODEMUS predicated his *hope* upon his *fleshly* birth—upon his being a son of Abraham, according to the flesh. And the object before the Lord's mind at the time, was to correct this fatal error. John the Baptist taught the Jews:—"Think not to say within yourselves *we have Abraham to our father*, for God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham." In our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus, we have this subject presented and illustrated in the clearest manner. "Except a man," says Jesus, "*be born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Nicodemus having his whole mind pre-occupied by his fleshly birth, exclaims, "how can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" Nicodemus does not comprehend the subject. Now, what did Jesus do? HE EXPLAINS the truth he had previously announced to Nicodemus, by saying "except a man be born of water, and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "That which is born of the flesh, is flesh," (and *not water*.) "And that which is born of the spirit, is spirit, (or spiritual.) "Marvel not that I said to thee, ye must be BORN AGAIN," (the very proposition which he had at first announced.) To be '*born again*," then, is to be "born of water and spirit." Not "of water and 'OF' spirit," but "*of water and the spirit*"—TWO *agents*, but only ONE *birth*. This "new birth," then, is a perfect anti-type of the natural birth. The first animal, the second moral or spiritual. Generation involves a *process*. Re-generation involves the same. It is a law of nature, and of nature's God, that nothing can be born without "*emerging*" from that of which it is born. Now the saints are born from above —"born of God." *He is their* FATHER; and they, as his children, are "*begotten* unto a lively hope." His word—his truth—indited by his Spirit, is the instrument—the "seed," and an "emergence" from the water completes the *one birth*. And thus it is that we are "born again, not of corruptible seed," (as in the *first* case;) but of incorruptible by the *word of God*, which liveth and abideth forever." There is not *one* birth of water, and *another* of spirit; consequently, no "*coming up out of the spirit;*" but it is a process in which the *Spirit of God, the word, and water*, are concerned as agencies, concurring to produce the *one result*—A NEW BIRTH, of a holy, moral, and heavenly character. And this view of the subject harmonizes with what Paul says in his Letter to Timothy, concerning "the *washing* of *re-generation*, and the *renewing* of the *Holy Spirit*."

Making *two* births of one, has introduced all the confusion which we find on this subject. For, whoever severs what Jesus united in the production of the new birth, will make sad havoc of his teaching, and, also destroy the decorum of the figure. It is impossible to be born of water, in the Scriptural sense, without first being "*begotten* of God." A man may be immersed a thousand times, and if he be not previously begotten by the truth, he will be a spurious offspring—a bastard, having no divine paternity! That which is born of flesh, *is* flesh; and that which is born of *water* ONLY *is water!*

HOMO.

REMARKS ON HOMO'S POSITION.

If we understand "Homo" he makes literal *water* just as essential to the new birth as the Spirit of God. Without the water the Spirit could not produce a new birth. He says the "Spirit and water are TWO *agents* producing ONE birth;" and that "this new birth is a perfect anti-type of the natural birth;" and that "Regeneration involves the same process." That is, there cannot be a birth without a father to beget and a mother to bring forth. In the new birth he makes the Spirit the father and the *water* the mother; if so, we confess we cannot see how a person can be "*begotten*" except *in* the water. But, if we understand "Homo," he says a man must be *previously* begotten," or by immersion he is only "a bastard." If he is "previously begotten," that is while *out* of the water, then "the process" is not a perfect anti-type of the natural birth:" certainly a child was never begotten *out* of its mother's matrix—that is the mould in which it is "begotten." But "Homo" seems to admit that "truth" is that by which the new man is "begotten." If so, is not the man's own heart the matrix in which the "*seed*" is deposited? and not in literal water. In the "natural birth" the child "emerges" from the place where the "seed" is deposited. If so, and the new birth is a perfect anti-type of the natural birth, must not the new birth be effected by an "emergence," of some

sort, out of the heart of man, or, in other words, be a purely *spiritual* work, and not a *material* one? as it would be, at least in part, if it is an emergence from literal water.

"Homo" has a criticism on the word "OF;" and says, it is 'not of the water, and 'OF' the Spirit; but, '*of water* AND *the spirit.*'" Though the word "*of*" is not in the 5th verse, in *immediate* connection with the "Spirit," yet in the next verse our Lord expressly says, "That which is born OF the Spirit is spirit;" so that we confess, we do not see the force of the criticism: and "Homo," himself, afterwards says "The Saints are 'born of God.'" To be born OF God and born OF the Spirit we cannot suppose differs essentially; so that he, in fact, admits all that we contend for. If a man is "born of God" we cannot conceive that an "emergence from the water completes the one birth." If so—How was the dying thief born of God? if such a thing ever happened. Or, how were Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and all the prophets born again? No such *completion* of the new birth is recorded of any of them. Does the new birth now and the new birth in the days of patriarchs and prophets differ essentially? If not, and they did not have an "emergence from the water" to "complete the one birth," how can it be shown that in order to the new birth a man must emerge from water? Let us not be misunderstood: we believe baptism is an ordinance of our Lord; and one that should not be neglected; but, is it a part of the new birth? or, essential to that birth? If so, it was always essential. It was just as essential to the patriarchs and prophets as to apostles and other christians. There may be *duties* essential to be attended to in one age that are not in another; but this is not to be viewed in the light of a duty that depends on positive law, in this controversy. The question here is not so much about baptism, itself, as whether *literal water* is essential to the new birth. We know that without the new birth a man cannot enter into the kingdom of God: Is an "emergence from water" essential to "the one birth?" If so, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, so far as we have any knowledge, did not experience it; and yet we know that our Saviour hath said—"Ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God;" Lk. 13: 28.

"*Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God:*"

"*Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets*" *shall be in that kingdom:*

ERGO: *Then* THEY *will have been "born again."* Yet we have not the slightest evidence that they "emerged from water:" Therefore: Water is *not* essential to the new birth. We repeat what we have said before: we believe baptism to be an ordinance under the latest development of grace, and that all who embrace the Lord Jesus Christ should attend to it: but we consider it appointed for a very different purpose than that of *completing* the new birth.

INTERMEDIATE STATE.

BY ELDER P. M. WAY.

"Then shall ye return, and discern, between the righteous and the wicked."—Malachi 3: 18.

This text affirms that clearer light shall be reflected on the character and blessedness of the righteous, under the gospel dispensation. By the gospel of Jesus Christ, "life and immortality are brought to light." "Adam was made a living soul," Jesus Christ "was made a quickening spirit." Man, though lost, may be "created anew in Christ Jesus," may "pass from *death* unto life;" *which* "*life is in Christ.*" All, then, who obtain the righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ, are restored to the divine image and favour, constituted sons of God, and have secured to them all spiritual blessings, and a deliverance from all the evils which shall finally fall upon the wicked. Among these blessings, is not the least, that the righteous, soon as physical life ends, shall enter upon scenes of conscious blessedness, in the society of "the spirits of just men made perfect." There are many arguments in proof of the above proposition, but I shall confine my remarks to a very few, which, if I possess the power to "discern," are uncontrovertible. Prov. 4: 18. "The path of the just is as a shining light, which shineth more and more to the perfect day." And when the perfect day breaks upon the soul, does it sink into a dark, unconscious sleep? No, verily; the wicked may go into darkness, but the righteous shall be "light in the Lord." Hear the great teacher, Jno. 11: 26, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me *shall never die.*" Physical death does not interrupt our "life in Christ." "For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." *Death cannot separate us from Christ.*

The Saviour has illustrated, and given us positive assurance of this precious truth, Matt. 22: 31, 32. "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. *For all live unto him.*" i. e., all those who have died in the Lord, are alive still, and subjects of God's kingdom. But how plainly is this taught in Christ's transfiguration, Matt. 17: 1—3, when "Moses and Elias appeared, talking with him." Surely, Moses and Elias, though they had been dead more than a thousand years, were not slumbering unconsciously! Again, the promise of Christ to the repenting thief, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise," is so plain, as not to require a comment. What some are pleased to call a parable, (Luke 16: 19—31,) of Lazarus and a certain rich man, must carry conviction to every conscience, that the spirit of man exists, consciously, separate from the body. 2d Cor. 5: 1—10, can never be construed, by fair interpretation, to sustain the notion that the soul of the pious, when "this earthly tabernacle is dissolved," ceases its consciousness. It was that assurance, that his spirit should dwell in conscious happiness, when free from its present "house," that inspired in the bosom of Paul (Phil. 1: 21) "A desire *to depart and be with Christ*, which is far better." There are many other proofs from the Bible, but, to my mind, the above texts establish the doctrine beyond successful contradiction. I have not commented on the above texts, for the simple reason, there is no necessity. I have seen attempts to explain them away, but never read anything but what a biblical scholar ought to be ashamed of.

I know it is said, though there are difficulties in the above passage, yet the scriptures do teach that "The dead know nothing"! Now, I appre-

hend, the mistake lies in not "discerning between the righteous and the wicked;" and applying, indiscriminately, those passages of scripture, to the righteous and the wicked, which lie exclusively against the wicked. To notice a few of the most prominent which are thus misapplied, (I shall not controvert, here, the meaning of the term death, but will meet the argument on the supposition that all is implied that the destructionist claims, reserving the privilege of holding my own opinion.) It is said, "*The Bible teaches that* MAN, THE SOUL, *as well as the body, dies.*" Gen. 2: 17; "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." "On what authority," it is asked, "do we affirm that this is inapplicable to the *entire* man? On what authority do we affirm that the main part of man, *the very part which is chiefly guilty of transgression,* shall escape the penalty, and never die at all?" I answer, from the very good authority, a promise, which was subsequently made, that, though life was forfeited by sin, "Life and immortality" should be brought back and offered to man through Jesus Christ, so, that, all who believe in him "shall *never* die." But it is said, "man was not created immortal." And will you affirm, that he was not created *conditionally* immortal? Will you affirm, "though he had obeyed God, yet he must have died"? Nay, do you not affirm, that, after his fall, if he had access to the tree of life, he would "become immortal in sin"? Is it not clear, then, that spiritual life and spiritual death were involved in the penalty, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die"? And that physical or temporal death followed as a consequence? "The creature was made subject to death, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." If so, then, God "told the truth," and "the serpent" lied.

Again, it is said, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Ezek. 18: 4. "Why, then, do any speak of the *never dying soul?*" I answer; for the very good reason, that God added Ezek. 18: 21—23; "If the wicked will turn from his wickedness—do that which is lawful and right, *he shall surely live,* HE SHALL NOT DIE." How my good brother Storrs, or any lover of truth, could overlook this plain, positive assurance, is beyond my comprehension. "Ye shall discern between the righteous and the wicked." Again, we are referred to Ps. 146: 4, and Eccl. 9: 5, 6, 10. "*The dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward—also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished.*" I answer, does this apply to the righteous and the wicked alike? or, can "we discern between them"? By reading the third and fifth verses of Ps. 146, in connexion with the fourth verse, you will see that this language is affirmed of a wicked prince, in whom the righteous are forbidden to trust, because, when he dieth "his thoughts perish." So of Eccl. 9. Though the same event, physical or temporal death, happen to the righteous and the wicked, whilst the wicked perish, "The righteous, and the wise and their works, are in the hand of God," Eccl. 9: 1. Surely, then, there is a difference "between the righteous and the wicked." "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but *the righteous hath hope in his death.*" Prov. 14: 32. Ps. 6: 5, is quoted, "In death there is no remembrance of thee;" and also Ps. 115: 17, "The dead praise not the Lord." And, as though the question was settled, it is said, "The pious poet said, 'And when my voice is lost in death, praise shall employ my nobler powers.'" "The pious psalmist said, 'The dead praise not the Lord.'" Your quotation from Dr. Watts, is as one-sided as from the Bible. Speaking of the wicked, the Doctor says,

> "Like brutes they live, like brutes they die,
> Like grass they flourish, till thy breath,
> Blasts them in everlasting death."

So, in quoting from the Bible. It is the wicked "who go down into silence! that praise not the Lord. But we will bless (*or praise*) the Lord *from this time forth, and for ever more*"!! And that, too, without a space of several thousand years cessation. The wicked do not "remember and praise God." No, verily, "Like sheep they are laid in the grave—but the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning." Let the wearisome hours of darkness and gloom press down the righteous here, and let the wicked triumph, death changes the scene. The light, shining in the distance, becomes clearer and clearer, till the light of the spirit world breaks upon his enraptured vision! Well did the psalmist say of the "ungodly who prosper in the world," "Surely thou didst set them in slippery places: thou castedst them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation, as in a moment! O Lord, when thou awakest, thou shalt despise their image."

But, how different with the righteous; "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory. My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion forever." I consider the question, "Is the soul of the righteous conscious between death and the resurrection?" one which does not necessarily involve other questions generally appended to it, and have thus considered it; but, as Brother Storrs affirms, that life is only attained at, or by the resurrection, I may hereafter devote an article to that subject. I will close the present, already too long, by a "reply" to your exposition of John 14: 1—3. "If I go and prepare a place for you, I will COME AGAIN and receive you to myself." Now, all is made to turn on the time when Christ "*will come again.*" Does it mean at the resurrection, "at the last day"? How prove you this? By begging the question. Let me state the argument. Christ *will come* to raise the dead at the last day: therefore, whenever the Scriptures speak of Christ's coming, it must *always*, necessarily, mean at the resurrection. Pardon me, brother; your argument certainly reads thus to me. In the 18th verse of the same chapter, Christ said, "I will not leave you comfortless, I *will come* to you." And in the 23d verse, "We *will come*," i. e., I and my Father "will come unto him," &c. Now, no sane man will affirm that Christ here means, in the resurrection. Again, Matt. 18: 20, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, *there am I in the midst.*" And Rev. 3: 20, "If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I *will come in* to him," &c. Was Stephen mistaken, when in death he said, "I see Jesus," and cried, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit"? No, verily. Christ did come and take his redeemed spirit to "a place prepared." Was Paul mistaken when he said, "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens"? "To depart and be with Christ is far better"?

"Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked."

Yours, for truth,

Syracuse, August, 1848. P. M. WAY.

REMARKS ON BR. WAY'S LETTER.

Br. Way's leading and concluding text—"Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked,"—declares a blessed truth, but we dissent from its application to the "gospel dispensation," if he means by that phrase the dispensation under which we now live. "THEN shall ye return," &c. *When?* Answer. "IN THE DAY when I make up my jewels:" *then* will God "spare them that feared the Lord," &c., "as a man spareth his own son that serveth him:" Mal. 3: 16, 17. In that day "ye shall return and discern between the righteous and the wicked," &c., "for, behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and *the day* that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that IT SHALL LEAVE THEM NEITHER ROOT NOR BRANCH." Br. Way will not pretend *that* day has come yet; but *that* is the day in which ye shall "discern between the righteous and the wicked."

Br. W. says,—"The righteous, soon as physical life ends, shall enter upon scenes of conscious blessedness, in the society of 'the spirits of just men made perfect.'" If this text, Heb. 12: 23, proves any thing in favour of the theory of Br. W., it proves too much, for Paul says—"Ye *are* come," &c., not you "*shall*, soon as physical life ends." Br. W. says—"*Death cannot separate us from Christ.*" He doubtless refers to Rom. 8: 35—39; though he does not give it as a quotation. If any one will examine the text, they will see, at a glance, that Br. W.'s conclusion is not quite correct. Death, indeed, "cannot separate us from the *love* of Christ," nor "from the *love of* God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord;" *therefore* he will raise his saints from the dead; for *that* redemption Paul groaned; see verse 23. The saints "*sleep*" at death, "in the dust of the earth:" not separated from the love of Christ, but *in* his love and remembrance; and when he "*descends from heaven*" they shall awake, and no longer be separate from *him*.

If they are not separated in the sense of being "absent" from Christ, by death, so neither are they separated by "life," or while they live; for Paul affirms the same of *life* that he does of *death* in Rom. 8th. The text has nothing to do with the saints' consciousness when dead, but to the *constancy* of Christ's *love*, which is not shaken even though his saints *sleep* one thousand or ten thousand years "in the dust of the earth;" but if there is no resurrection of the dead, "they *are perished*;" even though they "fell asleep in Christ." See 1 Cor. 15: 16—18.

On the text Matt. 22: 31, 32, Br. W. says: "The Saviour has given positive assurance—that those who have died in the Lord are alive still," &c. Tell us, then, thou "Master in Israel," how our Saviour's argument with the Sadducees proved the *resurrection* of the dead? the very point in debate. Does proving that "disembodied spirits" are alive demonstrate a future resurrection, "at the last day?" or, has "Swedenborg" convinced you there is no *such* resurrection? Br. W. next gives us a list of texts on which he does not "comment"—"for the simple reason, there is no necessity;" and says, he has "seen attempts to explain them away, but never read any thing but what a biblical scholar ought to be ashamed of." We, of course, do not know what Br. W. has "*read*," but *we* have read and written much against *his view* of those texts that we do not even *begin* to be "ashamed of;" nor shall we, till we can find better arguments on the other side than we have ever "read."

If we understand Br. Way—he maintains that it is the *wicked dead* that "know not any thing," and that when the Psalmist said, "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence," he meant the "*wicked* dead." Surely! And did the wicked *living* "praise the Lord?" When Hezekiah had recovered from sickness, which he was told, at first, should result in *his death*, and he was praising God for preserving his life, he says,—"The grave cannot praise thee," &c. Now, if we can "discern," he does say that if he had died, when dead, *he* could not have praised the Lord; but he adds,—"The living, *the living*, he shall praise thee as I do this day," &c. Isa. 38: 18, 19.

Hezekiah was a RIGHTEOUS *man.* Isa. 38: 3.

But if he had died he could not THEN *have praised the Lord.*

THEREFORE, *the* RIGHTEOUS "*dead praise not the Lord.*"

The Psalmist is equally as conclusive. Let any one read the sixth Psalm; David is there complaining, as the whole Psalm shows, of sickness and disease which he feared would result in death; and he piously and pathetically entreats the Lord to deliver his soul, i. e. *himself;* and adds as a reason for his prayer, "For in death there is no *remembrance* of thee; in the grave *who* who shall give thee thanks?"

David was a RIGHTEOUS *man.*

But, if he had died he would THEN *have had no* REMEMBRANCE *of God.*

ERGO. *The righteous dead are unconscious.*

Again. "*David is not ascended into the heavens.* Acts 2: 34.

Jesus Christ has ascended into the heavens. Heb. 8: 1.

THEREFORE, *David is* NOT "*with Christ.*"

Thus, "in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word is established," that Christ does not receive the *saints* to the conscious enjoyment of *his presence* AT DEATH.

Br. W. understands us to say—"Whenever the Scriptures speak of Christ coming, it must *always*, necessarily, mean at the resurrection." We are sorry if we gave our good brother any occasion to understand us so; we surely did not intend it; and if he will read our remarks again, we think he will be undeceived. The point in discussion there was the meaning and application of the phrase, "*come* AGAIN." To come *again* implies a *previous* coming; we showed that previous coming was *personal*—that the going *away* was *personal*, and hence to *come* AGAIN was to do so in the same *personal* manner; and not in some *hidden, secret* manner, altogether unlike the previous. Should we "state the argument" for our opponents as Br. W. has for us, we might say "Christ will come to receive the souls of his people at death; therefore, whenever the Scriptures speak of Christ's coming, it must always, necessarily, mean at death; therefore, he will never come again *personally*!" Would that be a fair version of my opponent's views? Not one of

Br. W.'s texts in disproof of our position affirm that Christ comes *again* at the time spoken of. *Spiritually* he never went away, and therefore spiritually does not come *again*; but *personally* he once came—personally he went away—and personally he will "come *again;*" then, and not till then has he ever promised to receive his followers unto *himself;* though Br. W. affirms he "did come and take Stephen's redeemed spirit to a place prepared." But the Bible affirms, Stephen "FELL ASLEEP;" yes, he *sleeps*, Br. W., and when the Lord comes *again* he will "*wake him out of his sleep*," and Stephen will not be conscious that he has slept a moment, if it is "thousands of years." Not one of the texts that Br. W. has quoted says that Christ ever came *again* at any man's death; or, that he came *at death* at all. We asked "for a single text of Scripture that says, Christ *comes again* at the death of his saints." Has Br. W. produced one? Let the reader judge.

THE SON OF GOD.—NO. V.

By HENRY GREW.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIVINE TESTIMONY RESPECTING THE IMPORT OF THE TERM SON OF GOD, AND WHETHER IT IS, OR IS NOT EXPRESSIVE OF THE HIGHEST CHARACTER OF OUR BLESSED LORD.

It has long been a sentiment of very general belief in the Christian church, that the terms *Son of God*, *only begotten Son of God*, are expressive of that divine relation to the Father in which his *highest character* consists. These terms are now considered by some, who are to be respected for their talents and piety, as referable to the humanity of Christ peculiarly begotten; and not as importing his most exalted nature.

In relation to this interesting and important subject, we may consider the following truths derived from the divine testimony.

1. It is in the character of the SON OF GOD, that the Saviour is presented to a lost world, as the great object of faith, and with the belief of this truth salvation is connected.

2. It is in this character, he is an object of worship.

3. Jesus Christ during his ministry on earth never claimed a higher title.

4. The highest title ever given him in the Scriptures of truth, even that of God, is given to him as the *Son of God*.

If these propositions are clearly supported by the word of God, can we possibly avoid the conclusion, that the terms under consideration import the highest character of our Redeemer?

1. That "the Lord from heaven," is presented to a perishing world as the great and glorious *object of faith* in the character of the Son of God, with the belief of which truth salvation is connected, appears from the following passages. Matt. 3 : 17; 17 : 5; John 1 : 34; 3 : 18, 36; 6 : 69; 9 : 35; 11 : 27; Acts 8 : 37; 9 : 20; Rom. 1 : 4; 1 John 4 : 15, &c.

2. That it is in this character he is worshipped, plainly appears from Heb. 1 : 6, When he bringeth in the *first begotten* into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him. See also John 5 : 23; Matt. 14 : 33; John 9 : 35, 38.

3. No passage can be found in which "the faithful witness" ever claimed a higher title. On this high claim, the charge of blasphemy by his opposers was founded. John 10 : 36. This claim excited their utmost rage. John 5 : 18.

4. That it is as the SON of GOD on the throne of the kingdom, he is called *God*, is evident from Heb. 1 : 8. Ps. 14 : 6, But unto the *Son* he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c.

The first chapter to the Hebrews illustrates this important truth. It is manifestly the design of the inspired apostle in this chapter, to set forth our adorable Redeemer in his highest dignity and most glorious character. He represents him, verse 2, as the maker of the worlds. Verse 3, as the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person. Verse 4, as being much better than the angels. Verse 6, as the object of their worship. And verse 8, as God. But it appears from verse 2 and 3, that it was in the character of *Son* that he made the worlds. If, then, his creating the world, if his being "the express image" of the invisible God, denotes his divine nature, the title of Son must denote the same. Why is he made so much better than the angels? Because he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. But what is this excellent name? It is the *Son of God*. This is evident from verse 5, For unto which of the angels said he at any time, thou art my *Son*, &c. But if this name is applicable only to his humanity, it must rather signify that he was made "*a little lower than the angels;*" and the inspired apostle appears wholly to have failed in his proof, verse 5, which he evidently considers as conclusive.

Mr. Fuller, in his essay on this subject, justly remarks, "The glory of the only begotten of the Father, and the glory of the Word, are used as convertible terms, as being the same: but the latter is allowed to denote the divine person of Christ, as antecedent to his being made flesh: the same therefore must be true of the former. The word was made flesh, and we beheld his glory; that is, the glory of the Word, the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." John 1 : 14.

John 3 : 16, For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, &c. Here our Lord exhibits to us the great love of the giver by setting forth the excellence of the gift. But all this excellence is comprised in the phrase, "his only begotten Son." This phrase must, therefore, include the highest character of our blessed Redeemer, or it is totally inadequate for his purpose, to set forth the amazing love of God towards us in "his unspeakable gift."

Heb. 4 : 14, We have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." If, then, there is any divinity in his priesthood, to give virtue to his sacrifice and intercession, that divinity is in the name of the Son of God.

So also, when he is exalted as King on the holy hill of Zion, the decree is declared, "Thou art my Son," &c. And when we are required to be reconciled to his government, we are commanded to "kiss the Son." Ps. 2 : 7, 12.

John 17 : 5, And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. The obvious truth in this passage is, that the Son possessed glory with the Father "before the world was," and, consequently, that these relations then subsisted. But if the term "Son of God," is not expressive of the Redeemer's highest character, it follows that the Son of God, so far from

possessing glory with the Father before the world was, has not yet existed two thousand years!

It is remarked by the respected author before quoted, that "God is frequently said to have sent his Son into the world." John 7: 18; 10: 36; 1 John 4: 9, 10. But this implies that he was his Son antecedent to his being sent. To suppose otherwise, is no less absurd than supposing that when Christ is said to have sent forth his twelve disciples, they were not disciples, but in consequence of his sending them. or of some preparation pertaining to their mission."—"Moreover, to say that god sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, is equal to saying, that the Son of God assumed human nature: he must therefore have been the Son of God before his incarnation. Christ is called the Son of God antecedent to his being manifested to destroy the works of the devil: but he was manifested to destroy the works of the devil by taking upon him human nature: consequently he was the Son of God antecedent to the human nature being assumed."

"It has been frequently suggested that the ground of Christ's sonship is given us in Luke 1: 35, and is no other than his miraculous conception. It is true that our Lord was miraculously conceived of the Holy Spirit, and that such a conception was peculiar to him; but it does not follow, that by this he became the Son, or only begotten Son of God. Nor does the passage in question prove any such thing. It may be a reason given why Christ is called the Son of God; but not why he is so. Christ is called the Son of God as raised from the dead, and as exalted at the right hand of God. Acts 13: 33; Heb. 1: 4, 5. Did he then become the Son of God by these events? This is impossible, for sonship is not a progressive matter. If it arose from his miraculous conception, it could not for that reason arise from his resurrection or exaltation: and so on the other hand, if it arose from his resurrection or exaltation, it could not proceed from his miraculous conception. But if each be understood of his being hereby proved, acknowledged, or, as the Scriptures express it, 'declared to be the Son of God with power,' all is easy and consistent."

Rom. 1: 3,4, is an instructive passage. Our Lord was "made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness," &c. It is admitted by learned Trinitarians that "it is not the third person in the Trinity that is referred to here." (See Barnes, Poole, &c. on the passage.) It is Christ's spirit in contrast with his body. He was of the seed of David in respect to his flesh or body. Observe, not according to his flesh and human soul, but simply in respect to his flesh or body. "A body, (not body and soul,) hast thou prepared me." "The Word was made flesh," not flesh and soul. But "according," or, in respect, to his spirit, he was "the Son of God." The passage proves that he was so before his incarnation. Mr. Barnes observes, "The expression according to the spirit of holiness does not indeed of itself imply divinity. It denotes that holy and more exalted nature, which he possessed as distinguished from the human." The distinction, however, in the passage, is not between two spirits of different natures, but simply between the nature and origin of his one holy spirit and the nature and origin of that flesh or body which that spirit assumed.

We have, then, sufficient proof from the divine estimony, that the term Son of God is expressive of the highest character of our Saviour. The reflecting reader will discern that we have equal proof that he is, in his highest nature, "the only begotten of the Father," and must, therefore, be necessarily dependent on him for all things, agreeably to Christ's own words: "all things are delivered unto me of my Father." Mr. Fuller, although a Trinitarian, acknowledged in the conclusion of his essay on the sonship of Christ, that "in the order of nature, the Father must have existed before the Son."* He indeed supposed the Son to be "properly eternal," as well as the Father. But to reconcile this idea with the above concession, is, to me at least, absolutely impossible.

Is this with any of us a subject of mere speculation? God forbid; In this name, my brethren, is concentrated all the glory of God ever viewed by mortal minds. In this name centers all our hope, and peace, and joy. It is this dear name that draws forth our souls to Jehovah, in wonder, love, and praise. This is the blest name that comprises all those glorious "things the angels desire to look into." And it is in the knowledge, love and adoration of this name that the saints shall be "filled with all the fulness of God."

"Oh, may I live to reach the place,
Where he unveils his lovely face;
Where all his beauties you behold,
And sing his name to harps of gold."

Br. Henry Heyes writes from Worcester, Mass.:—

Br. Storrs:—I perused with interest the articles by Br. Walsh on the Kingdom of God, which appeared in several numbers of the Examiner: I was not aware, however, that he had finished them when the last appeared. I looked for more from him upon the subject. The last three numbers contain nothing more from his pen on that subject. I would enquire, if he considers he has completed it *in the main*, not to say *the whole*? If so, I think it will be easy to show, there is much he has left untouched, and much too that is important to be considered.

With the articles of Dr. Thomas and Br. Grew, I have also been much interested. If Dr. T. be correct in the belief that the unimmersed are, without exception, excluded from the kingdom of God, I think he is bound to show to the candid seeker for truth, however limited his intellectual powers may be, that immersion is the only true mode of baptism, in so clear a manner, as to leave no room for an honest doubt. On the supposition that Dr. T. be wrong, what a stand it is for a man to take—to allow a person may be prayerful, pious, sincere, Bible searching, truth seeking, &c. &c., and yet, because he has not conformed to a requirement he did not know of, must necessarily be excluded from the saint's inheritance! Bless God, there are some who know too well the enjoyment of communion with God, to be driven to doubt and despair by men's notions, however positively and emphatically they may be published. Notwithstanding I speak thus, I view immersion to be the correct mode, to which I conformed several years ago: yet I know such a person as a Christian man, exemplary, bible-loving, whose arguments in favor of sprinkling, I feel unable fully to refute. Shall I say to him, your piety, your spiritual enjoyment, your consistent works will all be fruitless—you

* Dialogues, Letters and Essays, on various subjects, page 134. Hartford edition.

have not been immersed—although you don't see this your duty, no matter, you have no reason to expect inheritance with the saints in the kingdom? No, indeed, unless by greater light through D. T., or some other means, I see more manifestly the correctness of the Doctor's position. But I may have more to say on this at a future time.

I am interested with the Examiner. I read each number from beginning to end. I had apprehensions of a want of *advent spirit* in its editor: but of late I have been in a measure relieved from such feeling. That while it is published it may be fully worthy its name, is the hope of your feeble, yet truth-seeking brother. HENRY HEYES.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, SEPT., 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Bible.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—The present volume is drawing to a close, and we are disposed to say some things thus early, that both our subscribers and ourselves may understand the position we occupy. We have given our patrons more matter, and a neater paper, than we at first promised. In consequence of this, the expense of publishing has been at least one hundred and fifty dollars more than was contemplated at the beginning, while we have made no charge, and received nothing for our services, and the Assistant Editor has not only given his services, but has actually contributed more funds than any other ten of our friends, since the monthly issue commenced.

We are satisfied from what we hear and know, that the Examiner is needed, and will be sustained, so far as paying the *printer* is concerned, and *we* never contemplated any *pecuniary* advantage to ourselves in publishing it. Though we are poor, and have nothing of this world's goods, we ask nothing of the friends of the Examiner, save that they see to it, that we are preserved from becoming indebted to the *Printer*. This can now be easily done if our present subscribers continue for the next volume, and send us only one new subscriber each.

Our purpose is, to continue the Examiner in the same form as at present, and at the same price; published monthly. Our terms are low, and we must insist upon *payment in all cases in advance*. We have no idea of doing as some do, that is, to be dunning our subscribers all the year, and telling them how much they *owe us*, and how much we are suffering for the want of it. We shall have but one rule, viz: PAY IN ADVANCE, or the paper *will not be sent*, either to *old* or *new* subscribers. No person will have a *bill* sent with a *charge* for the passing year, if they have not paid, and no one will receive the Examiner, after the present volume, who has not paid for it as above stated. We give this notice thus early, that all who design to continue as subscribers, may have ample time, before the first of January, to save *fifty cents* and forward it, which must be done *free of expense to us*, but may be sent by mail at our *risk*.

We have taken and are taking much pains to secure an amount of matter for the Examiner, in future, which we doubt not will give new interest to the paper. DR. LEES, Leeds, England, has promised to contribute to the Examiner. The article in our January and February Nos., on "Future Punishment," signed "PATHFINDER," was from his pen. In the present number, we have the first communication, direct from him, "for the Examiner," and we expect it will be followed by many others. Dr. Lees is "*Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Giessen;* F. S. A. Scotland, or Edin." His letter, found in this number of the Examiner, will prepare the way for what is to follow. We have a considerable amount of matter on hand, from his pen, of much interest. Some of his views differ from ours, at present, but, we are in search after *truth*, and if convinced of the correctness of his positions, we shall embrace them fearlessly. This getting into a stagnant pool, never to have a "new notion," as some are pleased to call every new thought that is at all ahead of the walls of *their* theological prison, we abhor. The great body of so called *Protestant* religionists are as much bound by the superstitions of Paganism and Romanism as Romanists themselves; they hug their chains, and denounce those who strive to set them free, and vainly suppose that *they* have all the light that can be elicited; hence they hate the light, and will not advance one step.

We are not of those who are ready to adopt every new thought that may be suggested, but we do hold to *proving all things*, not by the creeds or inventions of men, but by the Truth of God, whether that truth be found in the *works or word* of God. God's works and word must and do agree, and they can no more be found at disagreement than He can "deny himself." When men, therefore, ask us to throw away our *reason*, the noblest faculty with which our Creator has endowed us, or the noblest WORK of God in man, to follow *their* creeds, under the pretence that we must exercise *faith*, yea, a *blind faith*, in the doctrines of their own inventions, we pray to be excused. God himself has placed, in his *word*, the broad seal of his unqualified condemnation on all those who lightly esteem the reason He has given us: "Come now," saith the Lord of all, "let Us REASON TOGETHER:" Isa. 1: 18. And we are to give "a REASON of the hope" that is in us: 1 Pet. 3: 15. And Paul "*reasoned*" with his hearers, both from the Scriptures and "the things that are made," or the *works* of God. None but bigots demand implicit assent to their *dogmas*, and none but bigots,

and such as "know nothing as they ought to know," think that *they* have attained the *acme* of knowledge. The command to "*grow in knowledge*," is as imperative and binding as the command to repent, or believe. But there can be no growth in knowledge, while men refuse to admit a doubt as to their previous theories. The admission of doubt does not imply an abandonment of the views, but only leaves the mind open to investigate: the investigation may result in the full confirmation in previous views, and in that case we shall be able to give a reason to every man that asketh us. Most religionists, at present, can give no better answer for their faith or practice, than that their church, or fore-fathers, believed and did so. We pity all such. May they attain unto that freedom which the word and works of God giveth, through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

"THE CHRISTIAN SUN," AND IMMORTALITY.—Some of the correspondents of "the Christian Sun," are discussing the subject of immortality. Mr. Alexander McCaine is on the side of immortal-soulism. He reminds us of the "mountain in labor," which, after all its travail, "brought forth a mouse." We would ask Mr. McCaine a few simple questions, which, we hope for the truth's sake, he will answer.

1st. Is there any thing "*good*" in man by nature?

2d. If "God only hath immortality," by what means do his creatures possess it?

3d. If man be born of "corruptible seed," whence his immortality?

4th. Is immortality an attribute, or an entity?

5th. What is life?

6th. What is death?

When Mr. McCaine has answered these questions, we have a few more to propound for his solution. J. T. W.

P. S. Will the "Christian Sun" copy the above?

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.—As we come to make up our paper for this month, we see that the subject of baptism occupies a larger space than some may think desirable. If the subject is to be further discussed, we suggest if it would not be best to confine the remarks, till that point is sufficiently examined, to this one question:

Is baptism, with water, EXCLUSIVELY *by immersion?*

We received an article, some months since, in defence of baptism by sprinkling, but thought not best to publish it, and were willing that every person should "be fully persuaded in his own mind;" but as Br. Magruder thinks that wont do for "a Bible Examiner," we are willing the discussion should go on, but, let us have a definite point. This remark is not designed to interfere with Dr. Thomas's and Br. Grew's controversy. Let them finish as they please.

PROGRESS OF THE TRUTH IN BRITAIN.

We have received a communication from the Editor of the *Truth Seeker and Christian Thinker*, DR. FREDERIC RICHARD LEES, of Leeds, England, from which we have pleasure in quoting the following extracts. They evince that the Truth is travelling far and fast over the world—that the days of the Fraud and Falsehood of misnamed "*Orthodoxy*," are indeed numbered—and they prove, once again, the justness of the old persuasion, that "Truth is stronger than all things: it liveth and conquereth for evermore."

LEEDS, July 15th, 1848.

"MY DEAR MR. STORRS:—I respond with pleasure to your request for information as to the state and progress of '*the Immortality question*,' in England and Europe; and gladly furnish you with such as I am in possession of. Of Europe generally, or rather of its profoundest scholars and Divines in Sweden, Germany, and France, I can affirm that their closer acquaintance with the machinery and organization of the Divine developments *in nature*,—and the perception of the want of clearer and better definitions than an effete orthodoxy can furnish,—have led to the abandonment of those old *idea-less* phrases concerning 'Mind' or 'Spirit,' which represent *Thought* as existing without a *Thinker*, and a '*Mind*' without a '*Man!*' The influence of SWEDENBORG's philosophy has been very considerable on this subject, for, taking its stand-point in the great principle that 'Man is an *Organ* of God,' it legitimately asserts, that neither in this life nor the life-to-come, can there be any *action*, any *life* or *movement*, without an *organization* of action, movement, or manifestation—i. e. a BODY of some kind, no matter whether we *call* it 'material' or 'spiritual.' Hence there *must* be—(according to all the processes of God's providence)—a RESURRECTION before there be a future LIFE—a *standing-again* (anastasis.) The Thinkers of Europe are also fast repudiating the distinction-of-opposition set up between 'Matter' and 'Spirit'—disavowing the notion of a *double substance*, and maintaining unity of atomic Substance, in variety of Manifestation. BERKELEY said—'There is but *one* substance—Mind.'—PRIESTLEY said—'There is but *one* substance—Matter. WE are now saying—'There is but *one* substance—*no matter* what we *call* it.' On the Continent, however, while the false form of the doctrine of *Immortality* is giving way in favour of the true one of *Resurrection* through Christ, I know of no eminent writer who advocates the Truth in the *precise form* which it assumes in America. Further, while many are *Restorationists*, there are a few who are *Perditionists*, (i. e. believers in the *loss of the Life* of the Wicked, by the *destruction* of that 'organization' through which alone *life* is possible.) The whole tribe of fallacies arising from viewing *Life, Mind, Personality, &c.*, as THINGS instead of STATES—and as *self*-existing instead of existing by and through *means*—are fast vanishing away with the *childishness* of the past age.

"Of Britain I can speak more specially and

in detail, both of the *Persons* entertaining these views of *Life*, and of the *Literature* they have given rise to. In the first place, I will give you the History of my own Thoughts and Efforts, and, in the second, an account of the Controversies with which I have since become acquainted, conducted by others, with a partial list of the *works* which they have occasioned.

"Some ten years ago I read Dr. Law, the Bishop of Chester's 'Theory of Religion,' and 'Essay on Death,' which rid me at once of *my faith* in the current doctrines of Methodism on the subject, though the half-dozen texts on which they are based, prevented me arriving at satisfactory conclusions on the whole question. I was subsequently led to apply my knowledge of Chemistry and Physiology to this topic,—to look at the *law of the procession of life and consciousness as God evolves it in Nature*,—and then I found, for the first time, firm foothold. Nowhere did I behold *Life* and *Mind* except in connection with a specific *Organization*, while every where I beheld *Life decease*, and Mind *disappear*, with *the ruin* of the organ. Everywhere I beheld an exact *Correspondence* between the *Organ*—manifesting, and the *Mind* or Life manifested. Everywhere, I beheld this law inscribed upon nature—'Use, and you shall secure Profit and Increase;—neglect or mis-use, and you shall suffer *Loss* and *Decease*.'—I then appealed to Scripture, and commenced my studies by a careful examination of *every text* bearing on the future life, or referring to Soul, Life, or Death, to Heaven and to Hell, by which alone I could gather the real opinions of the ancient writers. I compared the English version with the originals, always having my Hebrew and Greek Concordances before me, for the sake of readier reference to parallel Text and Context. The issue *you* will have anticipated. It opened out another volume of priestly frauds and forgeries, to be added to an already crowded catalogue. I rose up from my perusal perfectly satisfied that the doctrines of the Fire-Hell and its *Eternal Torments*, of the *self-subsisting* Soul and its *Immortality, were senseless fictions*, totally discountenanced by the SCRIPTURES, at any rate. This was to me a mighty relief—and I felt, for the first time, *fully* competent to defend Christianity, both from the fangs of Infidelity and the corruptions of Priestcraft. I had now the highest assurance of the Truth—Creation and Scripture were in harmony. In Leeds, and the neighborhood, I preached these Scriptural Truths. In January, 1845, I started, singlehanded, the (*Manx*) *Truth Seeker*, in opposition to the priests, who, throughout England and Scotland, were denouncing me as an '*Infidel*' for opposing their corruptions and their craft. I now thank God that they *did* denounce me: for it has shown me, more clearly, *my duty*. From that period I renounced all care for wealth and worldly success; I devoted all my energy, influence, and power, to their overthrow—and, by God's help, I will persevere unto the end. In the first No. of the (English) *Truth Seeker*, (a post Magazine of ninety-six pages, which I started the same year,) I assailed the falsities of *Immortal-Soulism* and *Eternal Torments* in a sermon on 'Profit and Loss.' This sermon, and a series of six others on the Future State, I preached in Leeds, Bramley, and elsewhere. Many converts were made. It was then published, and everywhere, throughout the country, from John O'Groats to the Land's End, it awoke thought;—the seed quickened, and the young plant of Truth took fast and lasting root. A discussion of the subject commenced in the second volume of the *Truth Seeker*, which was continued over two years. I send you some of the articles.

"In 1846 I began to find that other and influential persons in Britain, had also had their thoughts turned to this topic. My friend, JOSEPH BARKER, (now of Wortley, near Leeds,) formerly a celebrated Methodist Minister, but expelled for 'heresy,' had republished your 'Six Sermons' in a cheap form, and circulated them amongst his friends—'The Christian Reformers'—throughout the North of England. The late THOMAS FOSTER, the author of 'the Evils of popular Ignorance,' and the greatest writer amongst the modern Congregational Divines, had given up the notion of Eternal Torments, and within his circle of correspondents, produced a great influence. Archbishop WHATELY, also, had favourably noticed our views. In the West of England, the 'Destructionist heresy' grew apace. M. DOBNEY, of Maidstone, published his 'Notes,' which drew down some severe critiques from the monthly organs of the body. These he logically replied to, in a second and enlarged edition. In 1847, Mr. WHITE, a popular congregationalist at Hereford, sent forth his 'Life-in-Christ,' which excited the wrath of a disappointed rival priest (a DR. REDFORD) in the *Eclectic Review*, who grossly misrepresented the work. Matters grew so serious, at last, that the Congregational Union, in order to put down, at one blow, the double heresy of Restorationism and 'Destructionism,' engaged the services of R. W. HAMILTON, D. D., of Leeds, to deliver the annual 'Congregational Lecture,' in opposition to the heretics. The Lectures were delivered, and published and puffed in the handsomest style. They are equally eloquent and illogical: in fact, viewed as an instrument for putting down the stern *logic* and *criticism* of your school, the book is a dead failure. In a recent article in the *British Quarterly Review*, (a dissenting organ edited by Dr. VAUGHAN,) this is tacitly confessed. This writer admits Dr. H.'s deficiency of logic, and starts himself a quite novel canon of criticism. *Christ's language*, as he contends, is not to be interpreted by that of the Prophets, whom he is quoting,—but by the opinions of the later Jews, and of the *Pharisees* whom he was reproving and threatening,—and by their opinions as gathered from some fragments in the *Apocrypha* and *Josephus!* In other words, THE BIBLE IS NO LONGER TO BE ITS OWN INTERPRETER!!! How hardly put to it must the priests be, to be compelled to devise and adopt such a theory!

"This reminds me of a still newer theory, put forth by J. H. HINTON, M. A., of London, in a tract entitled 'Who will live for ever?' He answers, '*All*'—and founds his assertion on Luke XX: 27—38. The declaration, '*neither can they die any more*,' he applies to ALL the dead, arguing that as the seven husbands cannot be assumed to be *all good*, they must be representative of *all* men, of whom, therefore, Christ predicates *immortality in the future life*. The phrases which he admits to have always been viewed by commentators *as limiting the declaration to the good*, do not, he argues, *really* do so, while the full scope of the reply requires that there *should* be no limitation as to *character*. At all events, it is unfortunate that no one before, either in ancient or modern times, ever read the Greek text as he does. Neve
fact is only a *presump*
give an analysis of h
your consideration.

"There are many
the eloquent H. MELV
incline more or less to
these, we may place I
of Dublin. In Exeter,
lately got up on the s
mouth Brother, tak
question, (as you wou
2, new series,) and s

"Receive the assu
with you in your
have, my dear Sir, an
is a noble thing to be
a true life, this battli
have found God to
thirty-three years of
and parties, and de
God's help, raised
Seekers—fearless and
O'Groat's to the Land
up their voice for the
and persevere—and,
battle! The more th
is prevailing.

"My space and t
you will therefore pl
a token of my good
it, and must either
future time; the ple
you; on the whole, t
the mere *form* of res
spirit of it.

"

REPLY TO

QUESTION 1. "*Wi*
Lord comes?" c. o.

ANSWER. The ans
that, with present lig
biased mind can he
See Zech. 14th. Al
ter tally with the do
the advent," in our
vain the effort is to
the 4th and 5th ver
day "His feet sha
Olives"—and that, "
and all the saints [o
the 9th verse it is f
shall be KING over
shall there be one Lo
it is stated in what
many wicked, and c
answerable answer to
replying: "And it s
one that is left of all t
Jerusalem shall ever
worship THE KING, t
the feast of tabernac
the cutting off at the
besides "*the saints*,"
That those left are i
tion" is equally clear
ments upon those tha
forth in the 17th, 18
threatened "plagues

text as he does. Nevertheless, he *may* be right, the fact is only a *presumption* against him. I therefore give an analysis of his work in my Magazine for your consideration.

"There are many able and excellent men, (as the eloquent H. MELVILLE, B. D., of London,) who incline more or less to our views. Foremost amongst these, we may place Dr. WHATELY, the Archbishop of Dublin. In Exeter, quite a controversy has been lately got up on the subject; J. N. Darby, the Plymouth Brother, taking the *Hellish* side of the question, (as you would see from *Truth Seeker*, No. 2, new series,) and several others the *opposite side.*

"Receive the assurance of my sincere sympathy with you in your warfare against Error. You *have*, my dear Sir, and *will* have, your 'reward.' It is a noble thing to be *active* in the cause of Truth—a true life, this battling against Falsehood. I also, have found God to be with me. Though only thirty-three years of age, broken off from *all* sects and parties, and denounced by most, I have, by God's help, raised up a noble army of *Truth-Seekers*—fearless and faithful men—who from John O'Groat's to the Land's End, are everywhere lifting up their voice for the *Truth*. Let us take courage, and persevere—and, at any rate, we can *die* in the battle! The more the enemy rage, the more reason is prevailing.

"My space and time are now both exhausted, you will therefore please accept this hasty letter as a token of my good will. I have no time to copy it, and must either send it as it is, or delay to a future time; the pleasure of communicating with you; on the whole, therefore, I conclude to neglect the mere *form* of respect, in order to fulfil the true *spirit* of it. Faithfully yours,

"FREDERIC RICHARD LEES."

REPLY TO MORE QUESTIONS.

QUESTION 1. "*Will there be probation after the Lord comes?*" C. O. T.

ANSWER. The answer to this question is so plain that, with present light, we cannot see how an unbiased mind can hesitate in an affirmative reply. See Zech. 14th. All attempts to make that chapter tally with the doctrine of "*no probation*, after the advent," in our opinion, have only shown how vain the effort is to establish such a theory. In the 4th and 5th verses it is plainly said, in that day "His feet shall stand upon the mount of Olives"—and that, "The Lord my God shall come, and all the saints [or holy ones] with thee." In the 9th verse it is further affirmed—"The Lord shall be KING over all the earth: IN THAT DAY shall there be one Lord and his name one." Then it is stated in what manner the Lord will cut off many wicked, and concludes, verse 16, in this *unanswerable* answer to the question to which we are replying: "And it shall come to pass *that every one that is left of all the nations* which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship THE KING, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles." Here it is clear, that in the cutting off at the advent, there will be those besides "*the saints*," who are "*left* of the nations." That those left are in a state of trial, or "probation" is equally clear, as the threatening of judgments upon those that "go not up" is distinctly set forth in the 17th, 18th, and 19th verses. These threatened "plagues" certainly are not for the "saints" who are changed to immortality at the advent; nor can we assume the fearful position towards which some have seemed to lean, *viz.* that "if those left do not come up they will be cut off, and *if they do come up they will be cut off!!* All the attempts of Mr. Miller and his followers to get over this chapter have but involved them in the greatest absurdities. We once favored his views, for a time, of "no probation to any soul of man after the advent," and tried every possible way to harmonize this chapter with that view; but, could never satisfy ourself, nor offer an argument in favor of his position, but what we felt shame whenever pressed with, Zech. 14; till at last, in the winter of '43 and '44, we determined thoroughly to investigate the whole subject for ourself, and follow the best light we could find wherever it might lead us. We did so, and gave our mind wholly to that topic, for a time, with prayer for light and aid. We went into the investigation with the full understanding that if we were led to a different result from that we had previously favored we were to meet with the displeasure of those whom we loved as the apple of our eye; but at the same time under the solemn conviction if we were "*ashamed*" of Christ's "words" he would "be ashamed" of us at his coming. The examination resulted in the deep and abiding conviction—clear to our mind as the advent itself—that there will be left of the nations, after the advent, men in the flesh, who will be probationers for God's favor unto eternal life, though never to attain, so far as we can see, unto the high honor of "*kings and priests* unto God and the Lamb;" nor "to sit down with Christ on his throne," as those will who are accounted worthy of immortality at his coming. The texts of Scripture in proof of probation to some, after the advent are so numerous and clear, to our mind, that we can no more doubt it than we can question the advent itself. We cannot, however, enter more fully on that topic now.

QUES. 2. "*Who will be the probationers?*"

ANS. Those "left of the nations;" for—"All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee; for, *the kingdom is the Lord's*; and he is governor among the nations. A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation; they shall come and shall declare his righteousness unto a PEOPLE THAT SHALL BE BORN, that he hath done this;" Psa. 22: 27—31. Comment on this Scripture will not be entered upon in this place.

QUES. 3. "*How long will probation last after Christ comes?*"

ANS. We do not know—"Secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those revealed unto us and to our children forever." Deut. 29: 29. We repeat, however, what we said in the Examiner for August—"We see no evidence in the Scriptures to limit *probation time* to any period whatever." That it is limited with regard to each individual we cannot question; but, that it is so with respect to the race of man we consider a *mere assumption*. That the time will come when the trial of moral beings will be uniformly successful we think highly *probable*, and then there will be no more death or sorrow. We have light enough now to guide us into the fact that a more perfect age will succeed this than any previous one; and that be followed by another of a still higher order. But that ages will

not stop even then, is more than intimated by Paul. Eph. 3: 21, which reads in our translation, "*all ages*, world without end:" but, which Mc Knight translates—"throughout *the endless succession of ages*." Not one solitary age and then an eternal monotony; but, age after age, each rising higher in glory and richer in the displays of God's wisdom, power, and love; and yet unexhausted and unexhaustible, eternally. For men to pretend that they *know* there will be no probation to any body in any or all these ages, in some form or under some circumstances, we think is being "WISE above what is written;" for, we challenge the proof of one single text in the Bible where there is a "*Thus saith the Lord*" for any such *assumption*. It will not be enough to show that *many* have ended *their probation*: let it be shown that all have, if it is possible to do it. We ask, *Where is the proof?* WHERE?

QUES. 4. "*Will the wicked dead be raised before the thousand years are finished?*"

ANS. Our opinion, with present light, is—they will not. We confess, however, that we have but one text in support of that view, and that is in Rev. 20; and when we consider the highly symbolical character of the Book of Revelation we would not quarrel with any who think that a part or all the wicked dead will be raised at or near the time of the advent; and we must further confess, that such a view *seems* more in harmony with the general tenor of the Scriptures than to suppose the wicked dead are not raised till the close of the millenium. The future, or millenium age, is to be different from any that has gone before. If it were not for the 20th of Rev. we should be compelled to the conclusion, from the other Scriptures, that the wicked, who are dead at the time of the advent, would then be raised, judged, and "punished with everlasting destruction;" and that in the future age, or next dispensation, it being characterized by the personal reign of Christ, the sentence against transgressors will be executed *fully* and *finally* on all who sin under that dispensation, *at the time of their sin*, as indicated in Zech. 14, Isa. 65: 20, and Rev. 20: 9. But, this part of the subject we must leave for further light; for, each new dispensation developes some new truths which were only seen "through a glass darkly" in the previous one.

BAPTISM:—We have received a communication from Br. Magruder, of Charlottsville, Va., touching the discussion between Br. Grew and Dr. Thomas, going on in the Examiner, with some remarks on our Editorial, in the last Examiner. Br. Magruder's article is written in an excellent spirit, and so much of it as relates to ourself, we give in the present number, with our own reply. We would inform our readers, however, that the article from "*Homo*," on being "born of water," was received, and, with our reply to it, put into the hands of the printer, before Br. M.'s article was received. Br. M. will excuse us for omitting, in this number, his "Reply to Mr. Grew."

He says—Dr. Thomas is now in England, and the period of his return is uncertain: and asks the privilege to enter "the field in behalf of the truth" the Dr. "advocates." We have no objection to it, whatever, provided the parties concerned assent. But Br. Grew is now in *New* England, and where, exactly, we know not, and hence, cannot consult him to know if he is willing to accept a new controversialist in room of Dr. T. If he is, we bid Br. M. welcome to the work. We do not think Br. Grew will object, but we wish to treat both parties fairly, and therefore defer so much of Br. Magruder's article as relates to Br. Grew, till we can hear from him.

The following is Br. M.'s introduction, and so much of his article as relates to ourself.

MR. GREW AND DR. THOMAS.

I have watched, with deep interest, the progress of the discussion between these able disputants, in the pages of the "Examiner." The introduction incidentally, of the subject of *baptism* in the August number, has imparted additional interest to their good tempered and well-conducted controversy. The question needs discussion at this time. The diverse views and practice in regard to baptism among those who are animated by a common hope of the speedy and glorious advent of our blessed Lord, ought, if possible, to be harmonized, provided it can be effected without a sacrifice of truth and honest conviction. I trust the present discussion will tend to produce satisfactory results. If conducted with moderation and candor, it cannot fail to elicit light, and advance the claims of truth.

EDITORIAL STRICTURES.

"What truth was ever elicited without controversy," well remarks the Editor, and I applaud the sentiment. Truth never, but error *only*, fears investigation. The first has everything to gain, the other everything to lose, by free discussion. The present discussion, I trust, will exemplify the truth of these observations.

The Editor says, "We have been repeatedly urged to give our views on the subject of baptism. We will do it in a few words: '*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*'" Indeed? Is that the position and the province of a "*Bible* Examiner?" Surely it was not in reference to so grave and responsible a question as obedience to a *divine command*, that Paul laid down this rule. See the connection: Romans 14: 5—"One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Many bigoted sectaries decry and denounce the editor because he raises the cry "Behold the bridegroom cometh." Does he agree with them that the subject should not be discussed; that it is a non-essential, and urge again "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind?"

The Editor denies that baptism, administered to a penitent believer, is "for the remission of sins," although Peter says so expressly in Acts 2: 38, and asks—"How sins committed after immersion are to be pardoned without being immersed again," &c. I answer in the words of 1 John chap. 1: 9, "If we (Christians) *confess* our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness." It is then by *confession in prayer* that the *Christian*, having obtained the forgiveness of his *old* sins in baptism, is to obtain pardon for

those he may commit afterwards. *Baptism* then, is for the believing and penitent *sinner;* confession and prayer is for the erring *Christian.*

Again, the Editor asks how the "penitent thief obtained remission of sins." If the penitent thief had sought remission *after* Christian baptism was instituted, the interrogatory might present some difficulty. It was not until *after* our Lord hung upon the cross—until *after* his resurrection indeed, that baptism was ordained by Christ—that the declaration "*to all nations*" was made, "He that *believeth* and is *baptized*, shall be saved." The thief was not therefore under *our* dispensation. Saul of Tarsus was, however. How did he obtain remission? Did Christ *speak* his pardon, as he did the thief's? No. Read Acts 22: 10. Saul asked "What shall I *do*, Lord?" The answer is, "arise and go into Damascus, and *there* it shall be *told* thee," &c. Accordingly he goes to Annanias, at Damascus,—"a certain disciple,"—who replies to his question: "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee," &c.; 14–16 verses, "and now why tarriest thou? Arise and *be baptised, and wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord." We see then *how* Saul "washed away" his sins. Shall we not "go and do likewise?"

The thief may indeed enter Paradise without baptism, just as Abram, Noah, Job, and Daniel will. Not, however, because that is not God's appointed way to salvation, but because in their day and *generation* there was *no such* command. But can those under the dispensation of a risen Christ and his apostles, claim their entrance "through the gates into the city," who have presumed to "refuse him who speaks from heaven," and to "neglect so great salvation?" Has not Paul said of *all* such, "How shall they escape?" As to the supposed obstacle arising from "circumstances which prevent immersion,"—the answer to all such objections is simply, that no such "circumstances" can exist, for man cannot live without water, and where water is, there enough may always be procured for the immersion of the person; and even if health is so delicate as to peril life, it is better to *die* in the road to *obedience* than perish with those who are "out of the way," by disobedience to him who "has done all things well." The Editor well says, "it is rejecting light and sinning against it, that will be the condemnation of men 'at the judgment seat of Christ'"—Amen, even so. How transcendently important then, to one and all of us, to see that on a subject so plain and obvious as *Christian baptism*, we do not "sin against the light" of Holy Writ, and thus seal our condemnation "at the judgment of the great day."

A. B. MAGRUDER.

REPLY TO BR. MAGRUDER.

In our remark—"Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," we did not intend to be understood as having any *objection* to the whole subject of baptism being discussed in the "Bible Examiner," if the friends desire it. We have some reason to think that nearly all the patrons of the Examiner are *immersionists;* and we suppose it is also known, to nearly all our readers, that the *Editor* of the Examiner, with all the light that he has been able to gain hitherto, is *not* an *exclusive* immersionist; but, is willing that every person should act in that matter according to their own convictions of truth. He has always listened to the arguments of those who are exclusive immersionists, he trusts, candidly. With our present views, would even Br. Magruder desire that we should labor to disseminate the principle that "baptism is the *answer of a good conscience* toward God," and "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh?" 1 Pet. 3: 21. If, however, our brethren desire us to give our reasons for not being an *exclusive* immersionist we will do so: we are not ashamed of our faith in this respect; and if we find we have been wrong on this subject, we shall most certainly *confess* it. Truth we want, and nothing but truth, so far as is possible.

Br. Magruder is not quite correct in saying—"the Editor denies that baptism administered to a penitent believer is for the remission of sins." We said that the "Christian Magazine is strenuous for immersion as *essential* for the remission of sins;" and remarked that it "could probably tell us how sins committed after immersion are to be pardoned without being immersed again," &c. Any proof that sins could be remitted except *in* and *by* immersion we had not seen, in their argument. We are obliged to Br. M. for his explanation, but shall reserve our remarks on that topic for another time.

In reply to our indirect question, how the penitent thief obtained remission of sins if it is *essential* to such remission that a person be baptized, Br. M. says—"If" he "had sought remission *after* Christian Baptism was instituted" there would be "some difficulty" in "the interrogatory."

We respond,—It was *after* Jesus said, "Except a man be *born of water*," &c. "he cannot see the kingdom of God;" and that was the foundation of all we said. If it was true, in the day Jesus spoke those words, that a man must be born of water (meaning *immersion*,) then it was true in the day he hung upon the cross; so that the "*difficulty*" is not removed by Br. M's reply. The thief was *under* that "dispensation" which made being "born again," as stated John 3d, *essential* to see the kingdom of God. But Br. M. says "*Christian* baptism was" not "instituted until *after* our Lord hung upon the cross." In this we are agreed. Let us put the subject in the form of a *syllogism.*

Christian Baptism was not instituted till AFTER *Christ's death and resurrection.*

BUT, *it was some three years* BEFORE *that time our Lord solemnly declares, "Except a man be born of water," &c. "he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."*

THEREFORE, HE *was not speaking of Christian Baptism.* HENCE, *being "born of water" is* NOT *immersion for the remission of sins.*

If here is any fallacy Br. M. can show it. But let it be remembered, the question here is not whether Christian *baptism* is for the remission of sins; but, *Is being born of water*, John 3: 5, *Christian baptism?* We confess, with present light, we see no way to avoid the conclusion, that *It is not*: and this conclusion we arrive at from Br. M.'s own premises.

Br. M. says—"Abraham, Noah, Job, and Daniel will enter Paradise without baptism—because in their day there was no such command."

Will Br. M. undertake to prove they will enter the kingdom of God without being "*born again*?" Our Saviour saith "*Verily, verily* I say unto thee, Except *a* man [that is, *any man*: not under "*our* dispensation" merely: not a man in a dispensation *after* Christ's death and resurrection *only*, but any man] be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God."

Br. M. asks—"Can those under a dispensation of the risen Christ, claim their entrance through the gates into the city who have presumed to refuse him who speaks from heaven," &c. We answer—*No.* But that does not touch the question. We may have a different view of what *is* spoken from heaven: we may think, and do it honestly too, that the *interpretation* that is given by another is not the *sense* of what is said from heaven; and yet we may do exactly what we sincerely believe is spoken from heaven: that is precisely the point in dispute between Br. Grew and Br. Thomas; and in their hands we, at present, leave that part of the discussion.

Br. M. says "That no such circumstances can exist" as would "prevent immersion—for man cannot live without water, and where water is, there enough may always be procured for immersion," &c. Why then, brother, did John go to the "wilderness" of Jordan to baptize?

STRICTURES ON DR. THOMAS AND OURSELF.

By Dr. Nicholas Smith, Hallowell, Me.

Br. Storrs:—I have been amused to see you and Dr. Thomas, men who have the Bible before them, come to the conclusions you do in regard to "being born of *water* Note, *his* "being born again of *water*." I suppose Dr. T. has M. D. attached to his name: if so, he knows there never was a child born in any other way than by water; and there is no other way designed by nature for any animal to be born.—Is not this an "emergence" by the "compound of oxygen and hydrogen such as Noah's ark floated on?" I never have analyzed this water, but suppose it is composed as above. You quote 1 Peter 1: 20 to support your positions; but, you must see that the translation is incorrect; man is never *born* of seed, any more than he is *begotten* by water; "being *begotten* again, not of incorruptible seed," as at the first *begetting*, "but, by the incorruptible, by the word of God," &c. Now let us see if we can get simple enough to understand what Jesus meant when he said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh:"—"That," what? Why, that infant—that child is flesh "which has emerged from a place out of sight;" water being nature's assistant to bring about the "emergence," or birth. Can we get simple enough to believe Jesus meant what he said, "except a man be born of the *water* and of the Spirit" he meant just what he said? "That which is born of the Spirit is Spirit:" "that," what? that disposition, mind, temperament? Oh! no, not character, but a *state*; that man that is born of the Spirit is spirit; his whole being is spirit. You see the word is a noun, a *state;* if a *character*, it would be an adjective. You are aware that before a child can be born, it must be begotten, and from a "*fetus*" become a child perfect in all its parts; and at the fulness of time it is born into this *state* of existence, (not *character;*) and is sustained by the aliment God has designed, and the breathing of the vital air, or breath of life—it becomes a man. Now, in order for this man to be "born again" he must be "begotten again," not by corruptible seed, as before the birth by water, but by the incorruptible, by the word of God that liveth and abideth forever. If there is not an *abortion*, but he becomes a perfect man in Christ, he will have a *birth*, or be "born of the spirit," or "from above;" and will enter the kingdom of God and this will be as much a *state* as the first was; but the sects have made the *substantive* an *adjective;* and of course made void the word of God by their *traditions.*"

If the above view is correct, you and Dr. Thomas must be wrong, and if wrong, will you correct?

The Millennium.

Your millenium here on the earth—the return of the Jews—and probation after the Lord comes, the more I look at it the darker it appears. I see no place for a millenium, but in the air—in the city Abraham looked for, and Paul said was "above;" and, that "God has prepared for us a city;" and the moment the sixth millenium ends the seventh will begin, and will be ushered in by the Lord himself being revealed from heaven—the saints raised and changed and caught up to meet him in the air. This is "entering into my rest," as Paul quotes, and "there remains a *rest* for the people of God," or the keeping of a sabbath. Is not the seventh millenium or seventh thousand years God's *rest?* Will not the saints remain at rest, or reign with Christ in the air, till they descend in the New Jesusalem on the new earth? It must be so.

Is not "the earth that now is, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men?" For "the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, *in the which*,—in the which, what? why, in the day of the Lord that he spoke of in the verse before, which was a thousand years. You will here see that the earth will not be melted when the Lord first descends from heaven; but it will take place in *that day.* Can an unclean thing be brought out of a clean? Will corruptible and wicked men be raised out of the earth after it is filled with the glory of God? Note—"the whole earth shall be filled with my glory," not a part of it no! This melting will take place after the wicked are raised, or come up on the breadth of the earth, and will be as the sand of the sea shore. The devil and his company will then plan to hold the possession he has now got; but fire will come down from heaven and devour them; or, as Peter has it, "the heavens will pass away with a great noise, the elements melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works therein will be burnt up." This will be a literal lake of fire; or the hell into which the wicked will be cast, with all the nations that forget God, and will all be destroyed together; Isa. 1: 28. After this, the new heavens and new earth appear, and the New Jerusalem comes down, with all the saints who have entered into God's rest, or kept a Sabbath. They now enter the kingdom under the whole heaven; and now will have something to do; see Isa. 65: 21, 22; and will reign on the earth forever, even for ever and ever. Amen.

From the above, where will there be a chance for the Jews to return, or probation after the "Lord descends from heaven" and meets the saints in the air?

The heavens must retain him till all the foregoing takes place, or the restitution of all things. Where do we find in the New Testament, which is a comment on the old, a promise to the Jews, any more than the descendants of Ham, after they crucified their king? The only chance for probation after Christ comes, and the saints are with him in the air, is while the seven last plagues are pouring out, and while they drink blood, and the sun is burning them;

then they will blaspheme his name instead of repenting. NICHOLAS SMITH.

A single remark on Br. Smith's view of the millenmum, which is this: We do not see how the devil and his hosts, by going "up on the *breadth of the* EARTH," are to "compass the *camp* of the saints about, and the beloved city," which are "*in the* AIR;" nor how the saints are to "REIGN with Christ a thousand years in the air" with nothing to reign over. We shall give our views at large on the future age when we can find room in the Examiner. —ED. EX.

For the Examiner.

THE HEBREW SH'EOL, 'HELL.'

BY DR. LEES, OF LEEDS, ENGLAND.

A most powerful—and to the Priests, profitable—association of ideas, has been connected with the word HELL. By means of this association, they operate upon the fears of the fearful, and render them mental slaves and cowards, who *dare* not *think* for themselves, but accept their opinions *vicarially* and *pastorially*. Thus the Divine government becomes frightfully misrepresented, Christianity maligned, and infidelity engendered.

The vulgar, physical, and contradictory notions attached to the word 'Hell'—as a place gleaming with *flame* yet utterly *dark!* where *bodiless and immortal souls* are made to *suffer* misery *without disorganization, injury*, or *death!!*—find, indeed, a partial correspondence in Milton's Paradise Lost, but none at all in the Jewish Scriptures. The slightest collation of texts will show, that men have no authority for transferring the modern-made meaning of the *Fire Hell*, with its pains and penalties, to the *one* Hebrew word, trifoldly translated *Pit, Grave* and *Hell.*

SH'EOL means something dug or *hollowed out*—literally *shooled* or *shoveled*—i. e. a PIT or GRAVE—what is *grooved* or *grubbed* out. Hence also, what is *covered*—a '*shealing*' or '*hovel*'—a *hole* or *hollow*. All these words are kindred. In the Bible it *never once* stands for a *place* of torment. The modern quibble that the *place-Hell* is a figure for the *state-Hell*—is pure moon-shine. A 'state' *implies* a 'place;' and has, and can have no more meaning, or sense, than the *taste of a tart* without either *Tart* or *Taster!*

When SH'EOL *is* personalized, or localized, it is always represented as *within the present earth*, and, in regard to time, during, or at the boundary of this mortal life. In two or three texts it is used *antithetically* with SHAMEM, 'heavens'—i. e. the upper parts of the air, or *the heights above*, in contrast to the lower parts of the earth, or the *depth beneath*; but it is not in one solitary instance put as a place of *roasting* in opposition to one of *rest*—or as a place of *suffering* in opposition to one of *bliss*. The ancient Hebrews were complete strangers to the abominable conceptions of the modern Hell-mongers.

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.—NO. IV.

VII. WHAT THEN IS TO BE DONE?

Let no other test be used, in receiving to *fellowship*, than that the person give evidence, satisfactory to the church, that Christ has received him; or, that the individual is born from above, and is thereby of "the Lord added to the church." Such persons are entitled to *continued fellowship*, so long as their tempers and practice correspond with the precepts of the Holy Scriptures.

The apostle says, Rom. xv. 7, 'Receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God.' How did Christ receive us? Was it because we had a faith that was *unmixed* with any error?—This would be to claim that every new-born soul is *infallible*, and that his *judgment is perfect*. A position, we presume, no Christian is prepared to take. Then how did Christ receive the soul? He received him because the sinner was *penitent*, and because that penitent soul fled to him for refuge: and we are to receive him when the evidence of these facts is clear to our minds, and have no right to demand any thing more at his *reception*, or in order to receiving him.

He is to be received to *fellowship*, not to membership. No man, nor body of men can receive a person *to membership in the Church of God:* 'the Lord' alone has *power* and *right* to receive, and *'add' members* to his church; all his church can do is to extend the hand of fellowship; and this they have no right to withhold, if the person give evidence of his acceptance of God: to withhold it is an act of rebellion against God. The Scriptures apply the *name* "Church of God" to the children of God in any particular place as, also, to the church universal. See 1 Cor. i. 2. "*The Church of God* which is at Corinth;" and x. 32 verse, "Give none offence to the *Church of God*:" also, xv. 9, "I persecuted *the Church of God*." See Acts xx. 28. "Feed the *Church of God*." 2 Cor. i. 1. "The *Church of God* which is at Corinth." Gal. i. 13. "Beyond measure I persecuted the *Church of God*." 1 Tim. iii. 5, "How shall he take care of the *Church of God?*" And lastly the Apostle uses the plural, and says, 1 Thess. ii. 14, "Ye become the followers of the *Churches of God*." Thus we find the most common appellation given to the Church was, the Church of GOD, for this evident reason, it belongs to him. If it belonged to the Methodists, it would be proper to call it the *Methodist* Church; or if it belonged to the Baptists, it would be proper to call it the *Baptist* Church; and so with respect to all other names. But as the Church of God belongs not to any of the sects, as such, nor to any man, or body of men, it is manifestly improper to call it by any name of *human inpention:* and all such appellations, voluntarily accepted, and used, by a body professing to be a church, seem like a renunciation of their connection with the Church of God. We, therefore, call them just what they call themselves, viz: *Baptist* Church, *Methodist* Church, *Presbyterian* Church, &c. They, evidently, feel it more important to be thus designated than to be simply the *Church of God:* and they receive persons into their churches, not because the applicant is born from above, but because he is a Methodist, a Baptist, a Presbyterian, &c. We do not say they would receive him if they knew the individual *was not* born from above; but that is not *the* reason why they receive him; he must give them evidence not only that he has experienced the new birth, but that he is sound in their creed, or discipline, or whatever it may be that *divides* them from other professing Christians: nor does it help those sectarian churches at all, who profess to keep "open communion," inviting "all persons in regular standing in other churches" to commune with them. Look at it. You offer yourself, for example, to the Presbyterian church; you are rejected, because, you find

some one article in their creed, to which you cannot consent. You now unite with the Methodist church. Next Lord's day you are at the meeting of the Presbyterians, and it is "Communion:" and they invite you, being a "member in regular standing in another church," to *commune* with them! They would not receive you into their church, though they admit you are a christian brother by inviting you to their communion! Is it not thus evident, that these sectarian churches have set up a standard or test of membership in *their bodies*, which they admit, by their invitations to communion, to be above the standard that God has given?

Such churches can, indeed receive to *membership*: and they only can do the work; for 'the Lord' never 'added' anybody to a sectarian church; *that is man's work;* and what is most of all to be regretted, *such adding*, too often, *disconnects* the person from the church of God, by begetting in his mind the sectarian jealousy and party zeal which is opprosed to the law of love.

We will here call attention to Acts ii. 47: '*The Lord added* to the church daily such as should be saved.' See also, Acts v. 14, 'Believers were the more added to the Lord,' &c. Also, Acts xi. 24. 'And much people were *added unto the Lord*.' These texts show that being added unto the Lord, and being by 'the Lord, added to the church,' is one one and the same thing; and that though ministers and other christians may be instrumental in this work, yet, the *act of adding* is the act of the Lord himself; and men have no negative in this matter, nor right to withhold fellowship when it is done.

As no man nor body of men can receive a *member into the Church of God*, so, they are not competent to '*excommunicate*' from the church.—That, also is the prerogative of Him who has 'the key of David, that openeth and no man shutteth; and shutteth and no man openeth.' Rev. iii. 7. We may, and ought, to *withdraw fellowship* when the individual's *temper* and *practice* indicate that the Lord has '*rejected*' him; or, that he is no longer a member of the Church of God; but, let him understand that *we* do not *excommunicate—that* is an *act* of the Lord; and that 'it is a fearful thing,' for one who has been a member of the Church of God, 'to fall into' his 'hands,' as a traitor to his cause. But while his *temper* and *practice* correspond with the Scriptures, he is entitled to fellowship by the church. 1 John i. 1, 7. 'That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you that ye also have *fellowship with us*, &c. 'If we *walk* in the light, as he is in the light, we have *fellowship one with another*.' Acts ii. 42. 'And they continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and *fellowship*,' &c. Gal. ii. 9. 'And when James, Cephas, and John perceived the grace that was in me, they gave to me and Barnabas *the right hand of fellowship*,' &c. To keep and promote this fellowship, where there will be a difference of opinion, on many points, in the same body, let us heed the apostle's exhortation, Eph. iv. 1—3. 'I beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace;' and also, 'avoid doubtful disputations;' that is, such matters as do not tend to promote purity, the knowledge and love of God; leaving all, in such matters, to judge for themselves, answerable to God alone. But if tempers or practice are unholy we are to obey the apostle's injunction, Eph. v. 11, 'Have *no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness*, but rather reprove them:' Such are the principles upon which we conceive the church of God is established, and by which all the children of God ought to govern themselves.

Such are the *Principles* of the church with which the Editor of the Examiner is connected in the city of PHILADELPHIA, Pennsylvania. Let all who read these numbers ask themselves whether they *owe to God and men any duty to sustain these principles*, and then act as they can answer to God at the Judgment.

Dr. Lees, Leeds, England:—We are greatly obliged to you for the Nos. of the "*Truth Seeker*" received. Only one has come to hand that contains anything from "Archbishop Whately," and that article is on "Universal Restoration and the Second Death." Will you send us No. 1, Vol. 1, New Series?

P. S.—The "*addenda*" is received, but too late for insertion this month. We have sent you all the Nos. of the Examiner for this year: if they are not received, let us know, and we will send them again.

The Six Sermons, Quarto, we will sell at the following extremely low prices, that our friends may have a chance to scatter the truth abroad. For $1, *thirty* copies; $3, *one hundred* copies; and for $5, *two* hundred.

"Rich Man and Lazarus."—The article on this subject, in the last Examiner, will be published in a *Tract* of 12 pages, 18 mo., corresponding in size with the Six Sermons in pamphlet, at one dollar per hundred copies.

Back Numbers of the Examiner.—We still supply them for 1848, or Vol. 3. We are satisfied that any who may subscribe hereafter will regret to be deprived of those numbers. The matter furnished us by Dr. Lees, much of it, has a connection with the article in Nos. 1 and 2 of the present volume of the Examiner.

☞The Editor of this paper preaches every Lord's day at Commissioners' Hall, Third street, below Green, east side; at 10½, A. M., and in the evening at 7½ o'clock.

The "Six Sermons" on the End of the Wicked, &c., can be had of the Author, 18 Chester street, between Race and Vine, 8th and 9th. Price, in Pamphlet, 15 cents, or ten copies for $1. The pamphlet includes the views of the author on the question, "Have the dead knowledge?" The Sermons advocate the doctrine, that "All the wicked will God *destroy*," or, cause them to cease from life, after the judgment. The work full bound in morocco, with Grew's thoughts on the Intermediate State, 37½ cts. Cash in all cases with the order.

The Aspects of Phrenology on Revelation; or, *Materialism, Fatalism, Regeneration, Creeds, Atheism, The operation of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of men*, and Human Responsibility, *Philosophically considered, in a series of Lectures*, By J. T. Walsh." Such is the Title of an Octavo pamphlet of 74 pages, published by Br. Walsh, Richmond, Va., 1846. For sale at 18 Chester street, Philadelphia, Pa., and by the Author. *Price 25 cents*, or five copies for one dollar, thirty copies for five dollars. Cash always with the order.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER, 1848. No. 10

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

"MENTAL DISEASE AND DEATH."

STRICTURES—BY WM. H. BREWSTER, MINISTER IN THE METHODIST CHURCH.

BR. STORRS,—With your permission, I will offer a few remarks upon an article, on "*mental disease and death*," by J. T. Walsh, Assistant Editor.

I understand him, in common with the deniers of the separate conscious existence of the soul or mind of man, and its immortality, to assume that the brain and soul are *identical*.

His whole reasoning proceeds upon this basis. The growth of the brain, is the growth of the mind, its disease, the disease of the mind, its death, the the death of the mind. He says—"the position of our opponents, is, *when the man is dead, and his brain resolved into dust, he still thinks and feels.*"

"OUR (his) INFERENCE, OR DEDUCTION: *If the above be true,* NO DISEASE OR INJURY OF THE BRAIN SHOULD INTERRUPT THE MANIFESTATIONS OF THE MIND."

He then states facts to prove what all believe, that injury of the brain does, usually, more or less affect the manifestations of mind. But these facts fail to establish an *identity*, and only prove that "while at home in the body," the brain is the organ of the mind; and hence, with a diseased and feeble organ, the manifestations of mind are therefore feeble.

Was the mind and brain identical, the mind would be affected precisely in the same manner, and to the same extent of the brain. But this is not true. It is now put beyond dispute, by the testimony of eminent men, that in different persons, every part of the brain has been *diseased* and *destroyed*, without perceptibly affecting the manifestations of mind. Now, while all he states can be explained, —on the ground of a *connection* between the brain and mind,—such facts as I have referred to, cannot be, on the supposition of *identity*.

He assumes, in this article, that the mind grows and decays with the body. That in old age, as well as childhood, the mind is feeble, and feeble because "the whole frame, including the brain, becomes shrunk and enfeebled."

Here, again, dependance, connection,—not *identity*—is proved. The supposition of identity would oblige us, in *every* case, to show that the weakness of the mind, corresponds exactly with the feebleness of the body;—but while the latter is "all *weakness* and pain," the former is full and *powerful* to reason," and triumphs, amid the pains of dissolution not unfrequently.

Were they *identical*, there could be no increase of mental power, after the physical organization had reached maturity. It would grow while the body grew, and stand still when it stood still.

The largest brain and the greatest mind would be interchangeable terms—a position contradicted by a thousand facts. In a few cases, even in childhood, while the frame is feeble, the countenance pale and deathly,—the most astonishing powers of mind are developed. Such is the case with the remarkable "Vermont boy',' who has lately attracted so much attention. Though a little, feeble, sickly-looking boy, yet at the age of ten, he was wiser than all his mathematical teachers,—had calculated and published an almanac,—invented a new mode of calculating eclipses,—and was master of the whole field of science.

Thus God vindicates the truth of the soul's inherent, transcendent powers, when the body is feeble.

But Mr. Walsh is a Christian, and willing to bring his philosophy to the test of inspiration. Let the idea be borne along by the reader, that on the ground assumed by him, it is the *brain* that thinks and reasons—hopes and fears—loves and hates—repents and believes,—is redeemed, enlightened, regenerated, and saved.

Man is wholly physical: and hence, the convicting and converting power of the Holy Spirit, is confined to matter: and "that which"—the thing which—is born of the spirit, is *flesh*, and not spirit, as the Saviour declares it to be.

Mr. W. tells us "that which is born of the spirit" is the *brain*, or, at least, matter, (*flesh*). Christ declares "that which is born of the spirit" is not flesh, but *spirit*.

If the brain and mind are *identical*, then may we read brain, where the words soul, mind, spirit, heart occur in the Bible, in application to the thinking power of man.

Num. 21: 4: "And the (soul) brain of the people was much discouraged." "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the brain." "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own" —brains? "My brain is exceeding sorrowful."

"Fear not them that kill the body, but cannot kill the brain:—but fear him who can destroy both brain and body in hell."

I will not pursue this: but if it seem trifling, I am not the trifler—I only follow where he leads. If he does not believe the mind and brain identical, he should say so, and tell what the mind is: and if it be a distinct essence, how he knows it cannot exist separate from *this* material frame. And if the brain thinks, reasons, hopes and fears, worships and adores, —does it take the *whole* brain to perform these offices? and if a part, *what part?* and if *each part*, how can the size of the brain have anything to do with the power of mind? If it be the *whole*, then the destruction of any part destroys the power to think

which is not true. If it be a *particular part*, then the destruction of the other parts should not affect the manifestations of mind, while the destruction of *that part* destroys the mind.

If this power belong to every part of the brain, considered separately, then every part of the brain must be destroyed, in order to destroy the power of thought, and there would be as many minds as there are parts or particles of the brain, when divided and sub-divided to the utmost susceptibility of division.

But if the brain and mind are not identical, but distinct entities, then the destruction of the brain does not involve, of necessity, the destruction of the conscious, thinking power, and for ought that he has shown, after death, "and the brain is resolved into dust," the man thinks and feels. If the brain does not think or will, any more than the heart, its destruction does not, of itself, destroy the power to think, any more than the destruction of the heart.

I have pursued this, perhaps, too far already, but there is something so repugnant to my feelings, opposed to *my* reason, and *my* interpretation of God's word, in the doctrine set forth, that I cannot look upon its propagation without deep feeling.

There live, alas! of heaven directed mien,
Of cultured soul and sapient eye serene,
Who hail thee, man, pilgrim of a day,
Spouse of the worm, brother of the clay,
Frail as the leaf, in autumn's yellow bower,
Dust before the wind, or dew upon the flower.
For this hath science searched on weary wing?
By land and sea, each mute and living thing?
Launched with Iberia's pilot from the steep?
To world's unknown, and isles beyond the deep?
O! star-eyed science! hast thou wandered there
To waft us home the message of despair?

Such are my involuntary exclamations on reading such articles as that I am reviewing.

Lowell, Mass.

Reply to William H. Brewster.

However well the gentleman may understand himself, it is evident that he neither understands me nor the subject before me. Of course Mr. Brewster will allow me the same liberty with his article that he has taken with mine. He will, therefore, excuse me, if, while I am *respectful and kind to him*, I should be a little severe with *his arguments*.

1st. He says: "I understand him," (myself) "in common with the deniers of the separate conscious existence of the soul or mind of man, and its immortality, to assume that the brain and soul are *identical*." Now, whatever others may "assume" on this subject, I "assume" nothing. I neither believe nor teach, that the "*brain and soul are identical*." Consequently, my "whole reasoning" does not "proceed upon this basis." And he will search in vain for any such intimation. If Mr. Brewster will turn to those numbers of the Bible Examiner, in which my articles on the "Philosophy of Man" are published, he will see the various applications of the term "soul," as used in the Scriptures. He will there see, that I do not predicate mind of the soul, in the ordinary acceptation of the word; although the term soul is used in many places in the Scriptures to embrace, or include, the mind. Man is defined by the Scriptures to be "a living soul;" and the primary meaning of the term soul, is *life*: it would, therefore, be unscriptural, unphilosophical and absurd to say that the "brain and" life "are identical;" although it be not possible for *life* to survive the dissolution of the brain.

"The growth of the brain, is the growth of the mind; it's disease the disease of the mind; its death the death of the mind." Yes; the healthy "growth of the brain, is the growth," or increased development, "of the *mind*," but *not the soul!* For, an idiot, without mind, has as much *soul or life*, as the most intellectual. But the "*disease of the brain, is the disease of the mind.*" Yes; is it not so? Can there be disease of one without implicating the other? And is there any manifestation of mind after the brain is dead? Mr. Brewster says there *is!* "It is now put beyond dispute, by the testimony of eminent men, that in different persons, *every part of the brain has been* DISEASED *and* DESTROYED, *without perceptibly affecting the manifestations of mind.*"

Now, while the above statement, *in Mr. Brewster's opinion*, may have been "*put beyond dispute by eminent men*," I am compelled, by facts and principles within my knowledge, to deny its truth, and to class it with hundreds and thousands of other "*false facts*," published to the world by medical charlatans to sustain an antiquated theory, and save their sinking orthodoxy! The proposition bears upon its face the strongest improbability. What! EVERY PART *of the brain diseased, without* PERCEPTIBLY *affecting the manifestations of the mind?*" "EVERY PART DISEASED!!" All involved in disease down to the *medulla oblongata*, "in every part," "without perceptibly affecting the mind!" Astounding! But this is not all. "Every part" is not only represented as "*diseased*," but actually "DESTROYED without perceptibly affecting the manifestations of the mind." Friend Brewster may rely upon it, he has been imposed on by "false facts," facts which are nothing more than loose statements, made by men without regard to proper observation, and in utter violation of the laws of physiology. Such a state of the brain, as that represented by Mr. Brewster, is absolutely incompatible with *life!* No man could live after his brain was "*destroyed in every part.*"

If Mr. Brewster's "facts" be "true facts," how will he be able to reconcile them with the position, that there is any "*connection* between the brain and the mind?" His "facts" not only upset my theory, but his own also! Like Samson, while he slays the Philistines, he, himself, perishes in the general wreck! But there is a "connection between the brain and the mind," even in the estimation of Mr. Brewster. What is that "*connection?*" My position is, *that the brain developes mind;* and that, consequently, "when the man is dead, and his brain resolved into dust," he ceases "to think and feel." My friend, however, thinks differently.

When I stated in a former article *the relations* between the body and the mind, in infancy, manhood, old age, disease and death, I only submitted a proposition which every physiologist in the world, of any note, is prepared to admit. Nor has any fact stated by Mr. Brewster, upon this point, disproved it. The body may "be all weakness and pain," to use a strong expression; and still the person may be able to "reason;" but he who affirms that such a man, in such a case, is "full powerful to reason," "and triumphs amid the pains of dissolution," has certainly observed to no purpose. It may be, that there are a thousand degrees of mental vigor; and

it is possible, that a dying man, when death has not yet invaded his brain, may be able to manifest some degree of intellect; but to suppose that because he can do this, that, therefore, his brain is not the organ of his mind, would be to make sad havoc of all logic.

As it respects the intellectual boy, of whom Mr. Brewster speaks, I will remark, that the *nervous temperament*—that temperament which embraces the *brain and nervous system* generally—gives rise to *precociousness* of intellect. It imparts to such children a sprightliness, a vivacity of mind, incompatible with long life; and, also, positively incompatible with the possession of a deep, profound, and philosophic mind. But, let my friend remember, that this very *precociousness of mind*, in connection with an *undue development of the brain and nerves*, is but another proof of the *inseparable connection* which obtains between the *brain* and the *mind;* and that this *undue development*, or *predominance* of the *nervous system*, is, in fact, *the* CAUSE of that *precocity*. But, even if it were otherwise, such cases are rare; and they would only be exceptions to the rule.

After stating the case of the boy, to which I have just referred, Mr. B. remarks:—"Thus God vindicates the truth of the soul's inherent, transcendent powers, when the body is feeble." My friend forgot that this *juvenile intellectual giant*, who "was master of the whole field of science," had a predominance of the nervous temperament, which gave rise to his brilliant mind; and that his "soul" was not the "inherent" power in the case.

But, if this "feeble little fellow" is really "master of the whole field of science," all I have to say, is, that he surpasses all his predecessors. He has left Newton, Solomon, and my worthy friend himself, far behind, toiling after him in vain!

Mr. B. is continually arguing on the assumption, that I maintain the "*identity*" of the brain and mind. This I have previously denied. And now, let me enquire, does *he* consider the *soul* and the *mind* "identical?" "His whole reasoning proceeds upon this basis," as he said of me.

Let us examine this view of the subject. "The soul that sins shall die;" but the mind and the soul are "identical;" therefore, the *mind* shall die! What becomes of its immortality in this case? In the same manner I can prove the *mind* and *soul* to be *distinct;* Thus:

The *mind* can become *deranged:*

But derangement is nowhere affirmed of the soul:

ERGO: The mind and soul are not the same.

"The *life* of the flesh is in the blood." Jesus "poured out his *soul*," or life, "unto death. He did not "pour out" his *mind*. "His soul," or life, "was made an offering for sin." But it is nowhere asserted that his *mind* "was made an offering."

The *brain* and the *mind* stand in the relation of *cause* and *effect*. They are not "identical," but the one developes the other. Consequently, the following remark of Mr. Brewster, is out of place: "Let the idea be borne along by the reader, that on the ground assumed by him," (myself) "it is the *brain* that thinks, and reasons, hopes and fears, loves and hates, repents and believes, is redeemed, enlightened, regenerated, and saved." I am really at a loss to know, how any person could so pervert what I have written! Be it known, then, to Mr. B. that, when a *man* thinks, *he* thinks by means of his brain: that, when a *man* reasons, he reasons by means of the same instrument: and so of his hope, fear, love, hate, repentance and faith. All these mental and moral acts are performed by means of the brain. And there are appropriate organs in the brain for the manifestation of all these functions. It is THE MAN who is "redeemed, enlightened, regenerated, and saved," by motives, arguments, facts and principles addressed to him through his brain; or, if you please, through those mental and moral powers which are developed by that instrument.

But let me apply my friend's principle of reasoning to his own position, and then see how the case stands:

It is the immortal soul that "thinks and reasons, hopes and fears, loves and hates, repents and believes, is redeemed, enlightened, regenerated and saved:

But some men, such as *idiots*, *monomaniacs*, &c., cannot reason:

ERGO: They have no immortality, and cannot be the subjects of "redemption, enlightenment, regeneration, and salvation.

Again: It is the immortal soul that "*thinks*," &c.

But the beasts "think:"

ERGO: The beasts are immortal.

Again: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is *no wisdom, nor knowledge, nor work*, nor *device in sheol* whither thou goest." "Also, their *love* and their *hatred*," as well as "their thoughts have *perished:*"

But these *attributes* are affirmed of the "soul."

Therefore, the soul is not conscious in the intermediate state.

"Man is wholly physical," while, at the same time, he possesses *effective, moral and mental* faculties, which put him in relation with the universe, *physically, morally* and *mentally*. And it is his *organization* which makes him superior to "the beasts that perish;" and not the possession of an "immortal soul."

Mr. Brewster speaks of the "new birth" as though it were a *physical* production. "The Holy Spirit" operates on *men* as MEN, and not merely on what he pleases to call "an immortal soul." The spirit operates through the gospel, and moves to action by its motives and arguments, addressed to the reason and moral sentiments of men. It is not "an immortal soul" that is "born again," but *the* MAN, THE WHOLE MAN. Jesus said—"Except a MAN be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

But, let us look at this from another point. Jesus says—"That which is born of *spirit* is *spirit*," not "soul." Now, *man* has a *body, soul, spirit* and a *mind;* will Mr. B. inform me which of these is the "immortal" part? Which of these is the subject of the "new birth?" Thus Mr. B.'s *reductio ad absurdam* recoils upon his own head.

I affirm, on the contrary, that it is the MAN, composed of soul, body, spirit and mind; composed of flesh, blood, bones, nerves, and brain, who is the subject of a *moral* or *spiritual birth*, in contradistinction to his first birth, which was *purely animal*.

Again, Mr. B. says—"If the brain and mind are "identical," then may we, &c., &c. "IF!" This "*if*" is well put in, for we maintain no such absurd position. And it is a pity Mr. B. did not take its kindly admonition; for it would have saved him the trouble of writing at least half his letter!

But let me try him by his own rule, and see how his "immortal soul" will stand the ordeal. "And the" (immortal) "soul of the people was much discouraged." "*Immortal souls discouraged!*" Now, it is evident that the text means nothing, but that the people became *dispirited*—desponding. And was not this *feeling* produced by impressions made on them through the brain? I cannot conceive of an "immortal soul" discouraged! Discourage "immortality?" "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the (immortal) soul." Do "immortal souls" require conversion? "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own (immortal) soul?" And, seriously, "what would it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world, and lose his" brains? This would not profit him! But what did the Lord mean? He asked the question—"What would it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world and lose his *life*." "My" (immortal) "soul is exceeding sorrowful." Is *sorrow* an attribute of *immortality?*

"Fear not them that kill the body, but cannot kill the (immortal) soul—but fear him who can destroy both (immortal) soul and body in hell." Now, in the last text but one, quoted by Mr. B., he did not quote it all. Jesus said—"My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto *death*." Now, if a soul can be "sorrowful even unto *death*," I should suppose it could be "killed." And, accordingly, we find the *very* "soul" that was "sorrowful even to death," actually put to death on the cross! Yes, that "soul was poured out unto death"—it was "made an offering for sin." Again: Does immortality go to "*hell?*" Can immortality be "*destroyed?*" I had thought that immortality was *indestructible*—deathless!

The Lord taught his apostles and disciples not to fear those who only had the power of "killing" in the *present life;* but whose power extended not to the *life to come;* but to fear him who not only had the power of life and death *here*, but who also, had the power to "*destroy* both *life* and *body* in hell"—to put an end to your existence.

Mr. B. says—"If this seems trifling, I am not the trifler, I only follow where he leads." The gentleman is mistaken; he has not "followed" me, but an *ignis fatuus* of his own creation; and, consequently, he has fallen into a dilemma from which he will find it difficult to escape. And if he has not trifled, he has at least the appearance of it. But I trust better things of him in future.

Mr. B. says: "If he (I) do not believe the mind and brain identical, he (I) should say so, and tell what the mind is." Well, I have said so, I do not believe the mind and brain *identical*. The mind is an *effect, an aggregate of powers, or functions, developed by the brain*. These powers are *perceptive* and *reflective*. They embrace the five external senses. In a more general sense, the mind is used to express not only the *mental* powers, but, also, the *moral*. All these *functions* have their corresponding organs in the brain; and when those organs are diseased, their functions are deranged; and when they are destroyed, the mind is no more. A man think without a brain? When he can hear, see, feel, and smell, without the appropriate *apparatus* belonging to these functions, *then*, but not before, will he think, reason, and perceive without a brain! A portion of the brain may be diseased, involving the function of that part only, as in *monomania*. But if the whole brain be involved, the man will be *completely deranged*.

My friend is not a *mental philosopher*. Let him be wide awake, or the Philistines may surprise him. We have not said the hundreth part of what we have to say, but this may suffice for the present. If Mr. B. should desire to continue the discussion, I shall be happy to aid him in the matter, in all candour and truth. Wishing him all happiness, I subscribe myself,

His friend, respectfully,
J. T. WALSH.

DR. THOMAS' POSITION DEFENDED.

In our last we published so much of Br. Magruder's article as related to ourself, with his introduction. We now give that part of it which is a defence of Dr. Thomas' position in reply to Br. Grew, the latter having consented to accept Br. M. as "an ally" to Dr. T.

Mr. Grew's article in the August No., and the editorial endorsement of some of the positions he assumes, deserves a courteous and candid notice from those who think that Dr. Thomas is *right* in the main ground he takes in the argument. The Doctor is now in England. The period of his return is uncertain. His reply will be necessarily delayed. Mr. Grew and the Editor are both in the field against him. It is but fair to permit an ally, in his absence, to enter the list in behalf of the truth he advocates. I propose, therefore, briefly and as clearly as I can, to offer some scripture testimony on the question at issue, by way of

REPLY TO MR. GREW.

Dr. Thomas maintains that "repentance, immersion and holiness, are indivisibly essential to salvation in the Kingdom of God." To this Mr. Grew objects "as unscriptural and absurd," and adds—"Now, I say, it is absolutely necessary in order to stand complete in all the will of God, but *not to salvation*." When Mr. G. says the proposition of Dr. T. is *absurd*, he means to point his objection at "*immersion*" as an essential to salvation. He answers, that "without *holiness* no man shall see the Lord;" and that "except ye *repent*, ye shall all likewise perish." Now, how stands the *Bible* testimony as to the essentiality of immersion to salvation? Let us premise, however, that there is no dispute here as to the mode or action of baptism. On that point the disputants agree that *immersion* is *the* baptism of the Bible. Now, is immersion essential to salvation? What say the Scriptures? Let Mr. Grew turn to 1 Peter 3: 20, and read: "When once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was a preparing wherein few, that is, eight souls, were *saved by water*—the like figure whereunto even baptism (i. e. *immersion*) *doth also now save us*."

Mr. Grew asserts, baptism is *not* essential to salvation. The Bible declares "baptism doth *also* now *save* us." Which is right?

Again. Does Mr. Grew believe that *faith* is an essential of salvation? Yes, undoubtedly, for it is written, "He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved." But why make faith any more than *bap-*

tism an essential from this text? What *God* hath joined together, let no man put asunder.

Again. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" but it is immediately *added*, as descriptive of the *mode* of our having become children, "for as many of you as have been *baptized* into Christ, have *put on Christ*," Gal. 3: 27.

It is easy to multiply quotations to the same effect, almost indefinitely. See Acts 2: 38; Rom. 6: 4, 5; Acts 8: 12; Titus 3: 5; &c. &c.

Mr. Grew says, "as Dr. T. excludes from salvation all the unimmersed, I hold him to adduce one passage which necessarily implies their exclusion from the kingdom of God." I answer by citing the words of Jesus in Luke 7: 29, 30. Speaking of John the Baptist, he says, "All the people that heard him, and the Publicans, *justified God*, being *baptized with the baptism of John*. But the Pharisees and the lawyers *rejected the counsel* of God *against* themselves, *being not baptized of him*." Does not this passage "necessarily imply their exclusion from the kingdom of God?" Let truth and candour dictate the reply.

Mr. Grew says "Men are born of the spirit *previous* to their being qualified for baptism." This is true, if he means by "born of the spirit," *belief*—that *faith* is a qualification for baptism; but if he means, as he probably does, that men become *Christians* before they are qualified for baptism, he cannot object to being asked to *prove* what he affirms—for it is denied. If it be so, then baptism is not an ordinance for *sinners*, but for *saints*. Why, then, did Peter say on Pentecost, to those who *already* believed—"were pricked in their heart"—"Repent and be baptized—*for the remission of sins*." They were *Christians* when addressed by Peter, says Mr. Grew. But hold! *Christians*, and yet their sins unremitted? They were told to be baptized in order to get the remission of sins! If Christians, they were "*saved*," 1 Cor. 15: 2; and yet Peter says, "*baptism* doth also now *save* us." Still, they were unbaptized. If saved *without* baptism, as Mr. G. says, then Peter is not to be believed! The Corinthians "hearing, believed and were baptized." It was *thus* they became "saved if they kept in memory" the things they had heard. 1 Cor. 15: 2.

I pass over Mr. Grew's criticism on the phrase "*being born of water*," in John 3: 5; for while indulging his strictures on Dr. T.'s construction, he does not favour us with his *own*. In his zeal to repudiate a literal application of the passage to baptism, he brings himself to the conclusion that a "man may be metaphorically born of *water*," and thus, it seems to me, stultifies the whole passage.

I should be glad to pursue the subject in detail, and give the scriptural testimony at large, to show that "baptism is *one* of the conditions of salvation"—"remission of sins"—regeneration and adoption into the family of God—all of which, indeed, are synonyms, and express that "*newness* of life," the *rising* to which, (after the burial of baptism of 6th chap. of Romans,) constitutes a leading feature in the "form of doctrine" which we are commanded to *obey* from the heart, in order to obtain the glory, honour and immortality which is promised to the patient in well-doing.

A. B. MAGRUDER.

BR. GREW'S RESPONSE TO THE FOREGOING.

BR. STORRS:—As the manifestation of truth is our object, I cheerfully accept of Mr. Magruder as "an ally" of his absent friend.

Mr. M. has not attempted to refute my argument founded on Rom. 14: 1, which imperatively requires the reception into the Christian church of the weak (*i. e.* erroneous) who are "in the faith" of Jesus Christ. It is admitted that we must be in this faith *previous* to immersion, which is admitting that immersion is not essential thereto, for if it were essential, we could not be in the faith until we were immersed. The sentiment that baptism is essential to salvation, is therefore refuted by a numerous class of bible passages which connect salvation with faith. Luke 7: 48, 50; John 1: 12; 3: 14, 15, 16, 18, 36; 5: 24; 11: 25, 26; Acts 10: 43; Rom. 5: 1; &c. &c. It may be said that these passages no more prove that we can be saved by faith without baptism, than they prove that we can be saved by faith without repentance or holiness. The truth or fallacy of this affirmation depends on the question, whether or not faith is as necessarily connected with immersion in water, as it is with repentance or holiness? Most certainly it is not. No man has the faith essential to acceptable baptism without repentance. Faith indeed is itself reformation of principle. "How can ye believe that receive honour one of another and seek not the honour which cometh from God only?" But faith can and does exist without baptism. See Luke 7: 50; 23: 42, 43. Mr. M. offers 1 Peter 3: 20 to 22, as proof of his position. The question is not, "which is right," Mr. Grew or Peter? The question is, is Mr. M.'s construction of the passage (part only of which he has quoted) correct? It appears to me that the inspired apostle put in the parenthesis ("not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God") to preclude the very conclusion that Mr. M. adopts! The parenthesis shows that he uses the word "baptism" metonymically, in respect to salvation, and that the act of immersion in water will not save us. In conformity with this view of the subject, he told Simon, who had been baptized, that, so far from being saved, he had "no part or lot in this matter." Acts 7: 21. He was not saved with it. The thief was saved without it.

Mr. M. quotes Mark 16: 16, and asks, "Why make faith any more than baptism an essential from this text? I reply, because my blessed Saviour has done so by saying, "he that believeth not, shall be condemned;" but he does not say this of him who is not baptized, either in this passage or in any other. "What God hath" "put asunder," "let not man" join together. Faith and baptism are joined together in the passage *as duties*, but not *as equally important and essential*. In this respect Christ makes a difference.

Gal. 3: 26, 27 is also quoted. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" but, Mr. M. observes, it is immediately added, as descriptive of the *mode* of our having become children, "for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have *put on Christ*." This appears to be contradictory. If faith is the "mode" by which we become children, as the apostle declares, then we are children *before* we are baptized, and baptism is no more a mode of our *becoming* children than any other act of obedience. The phrase, "have put

on Christ," refers to the general obedience of those who have been truly baptized into Him, which obedience proves that they are children.

I have asked for one passage which necessarily implies the exclusion of the unimmersed from the Kingdom of God. Mr. M. gives me Luke 7: 29, 30, and asks, "Does not this passage necessarily imply their exclusion from the kingdom of God?" I reply, certainly it implies the exclusion of those Pharisees who rejected the counsel of God by John, to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. This, however, is far from implying that those who repent and believe will be rejected without immersion. The phrase, "being not baptized of him," does not, with the connection, necessarily imply anything more than their not being baptized of him with penitence, as he required, (for many of them were willing to be baptized, Matt. 3: 7,) proved their rejection of the counsel of God.

I am asked to prove "that men become *Christians* before they are qualified for baptism." Mr. M. admits that we *believe* before, and, with the apostle, that we are *the children* of God *by faith*," "and if *children*, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ," &c. Will Mr. M. abandon his position, or will he affirm that we may be the children of God by faith in Christ, and joint heirs with Christ to eternal glory, and yet not be Christians? I affirm that when the Eunuch said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, believing this with all his heart, as Philip required, he was a Christian before he was baptized. It is objected, "If it be so, then baptism is not an ordinance for *sinners* but for *saints*." I reply, baptism is not an ordinance for sinners until they repent and believe, and thus become the children of God. If the children of God are not "*saints*," I should be glad to be informed who are. Mr. M. quotes Acts 2: 38, and exclaims, "Hold! *Christians*, and yet their sins unremitted?" Nay, verily, I protest against a construction of the phrase, "baptized—for the remission of sins," that subverts scriptural facts and innumerable passages of divine truth, which connect pardon with repentance and faith. It is a fact, Jesus Christ being judge, that the believing woman in Simon's house was "*forgiven*" and "*saved*" *before* she was baptized. Luke 7: 47, 50. So was the man sick of the palsy. Luke 5: 20. That Christian baptism was instituted previous to these cases, and at the commencement of our Lord's ministry, (if not before, by John,) is evident from John 4: 1, 2. "Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples," yet, as they baptized by his authority and direction, it is written verse 1, that "Jesus—baptized." Surely it will not be denied that *Christ's* baptism is *Christian* baptism. Baptism is but the *symbol* of remission. Thus understanding it, the declarations of scripture, relative to the subject, perfectly harmonize. I would remind my friend of the importance of examining *all* the passages relating to a particular subject to ascertain the truth. Acts 18: 8; "hearing, believed and were baptized" proves the latter to be a duty, but not that it is essential to eternal salvation.

In conclusion, I present to the serious consideration of my intelligent friend another insuperable objection to his view. It excludes from the kingdom of God some who, *on the whole*, are more holy than some who are admitted.

HENRY GREW.

QUERIES ON BAPTISM.

In some of the late numbers of the "Bible Examiner," the subject of baptism has been introduced, and some of the correspondents have taken a very strange position, viz: that there can be no salvation without immersion. With your permission I will give the readers of the Examiner a few interrogatories, which may lead some minds to further thought on the subject, while no doubt, others may reject the whole as visionary and fanatical. It is assumed, without at this time attempting the proof, that John's baptism was under the Law, and was a type or "shadow of good things to come," and that the substance or antitype, was *not*, and *could not*, in the nature of the case, be identically the *same thing* as the type; or as Paul says, "not the very image of the things." As an example, the Lamb in the type was the sacrifice, which pointed to Christ as the antitypical sacrifice.

QUES. 1. Was not the probable mode by which John administered baptism to the multitudes who flocked to him from the whole country, according to the Law described by Paul, Heb. 9: 19, using a bunch of hysop or other bitter herbs, as the multitudes from Galilee and beyond Jordan flocked down *to* or *into* the water, John did at Jordan the same as Moses did at the *brazen laver*, when the tribes passed on before him, "*sprinkled all the people?*"

QUES. 2. Was not that also the typical baptism which Christ's disciples administered, John 3: 22—24, and 4: 1, 2, from the fact that then, John was not cast into prison, before which the *time* was not *fulfilled* for the gospel of the kingdom to be preached, beginning first at Galilee?

QUES. 3. When John says, "I indeed baptise you with *water* unto repentance, but He that cometh after me shall baptise (Greek *Baptizo*—will it do to read it here immersed) you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," are we to understand that the subjects were to be baptized or immersed in a literal fire?

QUES. 4. Will any one say that John's words were not fulfilled when Peter began to speak the words of eternal life to Cornelius and those that were with him, when the Holy Ghost *fell* on them as it did on the Apostles at the beginning? See Peter's sermon, or the word preached to them, Acts 10: 34, 44,—("MY WORD IS A FIRE,") and then his comment, chapter 11: 15, 16. Was not this the baptism of *fire* and the *Holy Ghost?*

QUES. 5. Does not the mode in the antitype correspond with the mode in the type, when Moses and John sprinkled all the people? and would the truth be conveyed, and would it be proper to say, that Cornelius, and they which were with him were *immersed in the Holy Ghost*, rather than the Holy Ghost *fell on them?*

QUES. 6. If Christ, or his people through or by Christ, were not to come *after* John and baptise with *literal fire*, then upon the same principles of interpretation, may not the words of Christ to Nicodemus be something different from *literal water*, when he says, "except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God?"

QUES. 7. If there is any doubt in answering the last question, can the objector show that the *time* when this being reborn takes place, is *not* at the time when they enter the Kingdom of God, which

most will admit is set up when Christ judges the quick and dead *at* his appearing and kingdom?

Ques. 8. Is there not a strong probability that Peter and the other Apostles, in the early part of their ministry, were as much mistaken and influenced by Jewish prejudice, when they applied water baptism after the subjects had been baptised with the Holy Ghost, as when they circumcised the uncircumcised?

Ques. 9. If there is no salvation without *immersion*, would it be benevolent in Paul to thank God that he had baptised but two or three; and would it not be in opposition to the command of Christ, as most understand his words to be to his disciples, "Go teach all nations, *baptising them*," &c., when Paul says, "for Christ sent me *not to baptise*, but to preach the Gospel?"

Ques. 10. After Christ's resurrection he directed his disciples to teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Was this baptism to be performed with water after the manner of the types, or was it done by the Apostles when they preached the word, and then laid their hands on their hearer's heads, and they received the Holy Ghost, and thus through them as instruments baptised with fire and the Holy Ghost?

Paul, in Acts 19: 4, contrasts John's baptism with the baptism of the Holy Ghost. In the fifth verse it is declared, that the twelve men were baptised, and in the sixth verse the manner in which it was done is declared to be by laying on of Paul's hands. The enquiry is now made, is there any other baptism left for the Christian dispensation, but the baptism of the fire and of the Holy Ghost—called elsewhere Christian "washing of regeneration;"—washing of water by the word"—&c. &c?

Peter says the eight souls saved by water in the days of Noah, was a figure of baptism which doth also now *save us by* (or, because of, Greek DID,) the resurrection of Jesus Christ. This baptism was not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God. Let every Bible reader answer whether it was water baptism, or the baptism by the Holy Ghost, that saved us; for Peter speaks of but one in the singular number! Which of the two baptisms washed away Paul's sins referred to in Acts 22: 16? Was it the one when he was filled with the Holy Ghost by the laying on of the hands of *Ananias* upon the head of *brother Saul;* or was it *water baptism* after he received his sight? Does not Ananias say that he was sent by Jesus to do the first, and says nothing about being sent by Jesus to wash away the Sins of Paul by *immersion*, as your brother Magruder supposes in the last Examiner?

AUBURN, N. Y., Sept. 2d, 1848.

C. B. HOTCHKISS.

THE DEAD UNCONSCIOUS;

OR OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—No. I.

Truth is what we desire, and it cannot be purchased at too great a price. Truth makes us free; and truth sanctifies us. Whatever else we have, if we have not truth, we shall "suffer loss;" even though we may "be saved," it will be "so as by fire."

The first text to which attention is called, is Matt. 10: 28. "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." We will approach this text calmly, remembering that "no scripture is of any private, or self-interpretation." That is: no scripture is to be interpreted without making a harmony of all the scriptures relating to the same subject. Now, as this text does not affirm that the righteous *are conscious* when dead, it can only be *inferred* from the language. If other scriptures do positively affirm that the righteous, even, are without knowledge when dead, then we must seek such an interpretation of Matt. 10: 28 as will harmonize. David deprecates death in thi strain—"Return, O Lord, deliver my *soul:* oh save me for thy mercies' sake: for in death there is *no remembrance* of thee: in the grave who shall give the thanks?" Psa. 6: 5. Again, the Psalmist, mourning over his afflictions, declares that his "life draweth nigh unto the grave;" and then adds—"Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" These texts show clearly what view the Psalmist had of the state of the righteous dead. They do *not have any* "*remembrance*" of God—they are in a "*land of forgetfulness*." Peter tells us, respecting "*David*," that he *is not ascended into the heavens.*" Acts 2: 34. David himself declares, "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness:" not when he sinks into the "land of forgetfulness," where there is "no remembrance of God," but when he "awakes"—*then* he shall be satisfied: not before. Psa. 17: 15. He tells us, Psa. 16: 11, "In God's presence is fulness of joy." Then he did not go into that presence at death; because, if he had he would not have to wait till he awaked in the likeness of God to be satisfied: unless we suppose that the dead saints have *fulness of joy* and yet are *not satisfied!!* It were easy to increase the testimony as to the fact that the righteous dead are unconscious, as well as the wicked.

Now we may return to Matt. 10: 28. Let us paraphrase this text. "Fear not them that kill the body, [or take away your present life or consciousness] but are not able to kill the soul: [are not able to reach you to harm you afterwards] but rather fear him which is able [after the resurrection] to destroy both soul and body in hell"—"gehenne." That the construction we put upon this text is not forced, is evident from the fact, that our Lord speaks of what God is able to do *after* the resurrection. He does not say, fear him who, after *man* has killed the body, is able to destroy *the soul* in hell—but *both* soul and *body.*" Showing that our Lord speaks of the *resurrection state* and *not the intermediate.* Man can take away our *temporal* life, but he cannot reach our *eternal life;* God can deprive us of both by destroying both body and soul in *gehenne.* We repeat it—In order for God to destroy *the body* with the soul, after man has killed the body, there must be a resurrection first; and hence it is clear our Lord is not, in this text, making any statement that the soul is conscious when the body is dead; but assures them there is a power, beyond that of man, that can make a final and total end of their life or being. This interpretation harmonizes with the other inspired testimony "*in the Psalms*," quoted above. The testimony of Luke 12: 4, 5, confirms the interpretation we have here given: "Be not afraid of them that kill the body [take away your present life] and AFTER THAT *have no more that they can do.*

But —fear him, which, after he has killed [taken away your present life] has power to cast into hell" —*gehennan*. But, as remarked above, to cast into *gehennan*, hell, the resurrection must first take place. But let us give still another view of Matt. 10: 28. The same word—"*Psuche*," translated "*soul*" in this verse is used in the same discourse at the 29th verse, and is there translated "life." Let the 28th verse now be read thus, understanding it as addressed to the righteous; "Fear not them which kill the body [take away *temporal* life] but are not able to kill [or destroy] the *psuche—life* [because *your life* is hid with Christ in God;" so that if men take away your *temporal* life, *after that* they can do no more. Luke 12: 4; for "when Christ who is *our life* shall appear, *then* shall ye also appear with him in glory"] but rather fear him who is able to destroy [after the resurrection] both *life* and body in *gehenna*." "*Our life*" is in Christ; *men* cannot reach that; but "*God*" can "take away" our "part out of the Book of Life;" therefore fear him and not man.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, OCT., 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Bible.

BIBLE EXAMINER: THREE OFFERS.—I. Any person sending us $1, current money, free of expense, shall have the Bible Examiner for 1849, and seven copies of the "Six Sermons," 18mo.; or 20 copies quarto. This offer is made to accommodate single subscribers in sending money; but we will do the same on any amount, for each dollar any one will send us. Please state distinctly which form of the Sermons you will have, and how they shall be sent. The 18mo. shall have added, to each copy, the article on the "Rich man and Lazarus," 12 pages, from the August number of the Examiner. Our price for the "Six Sermons, 18mo., in all cases, is 15 cents single copy, or $1 for ten copies when not ordered in connection with the above offer. Our friends can see how much to their advantage it will be, in ordering the Sermons, to send us one or more subscribers at the same time.

II. Any person, or company of persons, who will send us *five dollars*, current money, at one time, free of expence, shall receive *five* copies of the Bible Examiner for 1849, and *forty* copies of the Six Sermons, 18mo. (pamphlet;) for *ten dollars*, *ten* copies of the Examiner, and *ninety* of the Sermons: for *twenty* dollars, *twenty* copies of the Examiner, and *two hundred* of the Sermons. The two above offers extend only to the first of Junuary next.

III. Any person, or company of persons, sending us $5, current money, free of expence *before* the 20th of December next, shall have 15 copies of Bible Examiner for 1849: for $10 they shall have 34 copies: and for $20,—75 copies. We make these offers *now* to see how many subscribers we shall have to begin the next year.

BR. HENRY HEYES—Is respectfully informed, that I do not "consider" that I have "completed in the main" or "whole," the "things concerning the kingdom of God." But, for the sake of *variety*, I had "intermitted" the articles on that subject. At some future time, opportunity permitting, I intend to finish those articles. Every thing in the Bible is "important;" and I am persuaded that the time is not far distant when every thing recorded on its pages will be so considered; and that the distinction between "essentials," and "non-essentials," will be forgotten. J. T. W.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—The articles by Homo and Br. Magruder, were both too late for the present number; other matter was set up and could not be laid over; and besides, we think there is as much in the Examiner on the subject of baptism, this month, as is desirable in one number. They shall have their place, one or both, in our next. Nearly all our extracts from letters are crowded out this month, besides much other valuable matter.

POLLUTION AND VOLITION.—A correspondent of one of our exchange papers says: "It appears to me that man's moral pollution depends, or rests, upon his voluntary acts, and, consequently, that mankind are not morally polluted, sinful, or guilty, previous to moral action."

The Editor of that paper, one of the most *logical* ministers in the country, "*replies* as follows:

"All men, from Adam to the present time, have, without exception, commenced their responsible career, by putting forth wrong voluntary acts.

"There can no effect exist without a cause—there must, therefore, be a cause for the fact that the first volitions of all men are wrong.

"Evil volition, as an effect, can result only from an evil cause,—there must, therefore, be something evil in, or associated with, the man, prior to his volitions, which is the cause of his doing evil voluntarily."

ERGO: There must have been "something evil in" Adam, "or associated with" him "prior to his volitions, which" was "the cause of his doing evil voluntarily."

Can the *logician* point out the fallacy, if there be any, in our deduction from his premises? We believe he cannot without denying his first proposition. *Adam* did, so far as there is any evidence to the contrary, "commence" his "responsible career, by putting forth wrong voluntary acts." Our logical brother *seems* to admit that fact; though, we suppose, he did not intend it; but, can he prove the contrary? But, if he can, he has another point equally as difficult to prove, viz.: that "all men, *without exception*, commenced their responsible career, by

putting forth wrong voluntary acts." Job says: "I have guided the widow from my *mother's womb.*" That was not a "wrong act." See Job 31: 15–18. If this be true, our brother's *logic is false in the premises; hence, his conclusion fails.*

CLERICAL MISREPRESENTATIONS.

LETTER FROM DR. LEE.

Meltonsville, N. C., August, 1848.

BR. STORRS:—In the fluctuations of opinions, and imaginations purely human and heathen; amid the revolutions of doctrines and speculations, one bright, true light continues still to enlighten, benefit, and dazzle mankind. It is a glorious light. It will ever retain its transforming influences, while gratitude and admiration shall swell the voice of praise; while freedom shall prompt to deliberations, or equity hold her balance upon earth. If there is one place where this light should shine more effulgently than in any other, it is the Pulpit. But when the Pulpit becomes the vehicle of gross, palpable prejudice and ignorance—of unintelligible jargon and unfathomable mysticism—of furious fanaticism and rabid falsehood—it is an instrument most destructive of the peace, the interest, and the happiness of mankind. And has it ever been thus prostituted to purposes so vile and execrable? the gratification of unmixed malice, unbounded prejudice, and unmitigated hatred?

I told you in a former letter that a certain class of would-be-preachers were rabid in their denunciations, &c. I said the truth. Their madness has reached its *crisis*. It is no longer difficult, from the diagnostic symptoms, to prognosticate its termination—the lake of fire—*unless they repent.*

One of these giants in prejudice, presumption and foul misrepresentation, asserted, on the third Sabbath in this month, that he saw a letter by I. F. Lee, in the Bible Examiner, wherein he (I. F. Lee) denied "*the dissolution of the soul and body,*" &c. I arose, denied the assertion, and assured the congregation that Dwight Hays had asserted a palpable falsehood, and that he who would deliberately utter so foul a calumny, could hardly be credited, even when he told the truth. I procured the pamphlets immediately, and then observed, that if any doubted my word, I would read the extracts after dismission. Other equally unfounded assertions he made, manifesting as clear a case of mania a stultitia as that of the fool, who said in his heart there is no God. Will you have the kindness, my dear Brother, to inform your readers, whether or not I have ever made such an assertion in any letter addressed to you, either *published* or unpublished. Have I ever either affirmed or denied the dissolution of the soul and body. I hope you will ever prove a true witness. Out then with the truth. I now call upon you to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in this case, for the sake of truth, and the *edification* of such friends as the caluminator, Dwight Hays, may have. The readers of the Bible Examiner, in this county and elsewhere, should know that I. F. Lee is not deranged, but understands too well the import of words to deny the dissolution of the soul and body. I believe with Adam Clark, that "the *first death is the destruction* of the body through time—the second death the destruction of the soul and body through eternity."

In hope of eternal life at the appearing and kingdom of Jesus Christ, I am truly yours,

I. F. LEE.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Dr. Lee has never written us anything of the character attributed to him by his *clerical* [we suppose] accuser. Clerical opponents, who misrepresent us, are the most unprincipled of all opponents: because they either *do know* better, or they stand in a position where they *ought* to know better than to misrepresent what we have done, or than to attribute words to us which we never uttered; they are, however, the last men who have the Christian principle frankly to acknowledge that they were even mistaken. We have been the victim of this unprincipled conduct, more than once, from some of that class of men. The principle upon which they act is,—"The end sanctifies the means," or,—"Let us do evil that good may come." One of this class accused us publicly, some year ago,—in a paper of which he is editor and publisher,—of having expressed a sentiment which we never uttered; and he further charged us with saying that the statement was true, "when" we "*knew*" it was not: that is,—he charged us with telling a *wilful falsehood;* and, when he was shown that we never made such a statement as he attributed to us, he entirely neglected to correct his mistake, but has left his readers under the impression to this day, that we were guilty of the charge. That same clerical leader, through his paper, lately made the following scurrilous attack upon Dr. Lees, of Leeds, England;—manifestly, having reference to that gentleman's letter in the last Examiner.

"An English writer says, that when he came to believe there was no 'fire-hell and its endless torments,' it was to him 'a mighty relief.' No doubt it was!—

'No rogue e'er felt the halter draw
With good opinion of the law.'"

Thus this clerical gentleman, and his amanuensis attempt to stab Dr. Lees, of England, in the dark, and make the impression that he is a "*rogue*" that deserves a "fire-hell and *eternal torments.*" Yet, this same clerical character can get his *sect* in their "Conferences," to pass resolutions approbating all he does, and expressing unbounded confidence in him; and some of those who voted for those resolutions, *profess* that *they* do not believe in "endless torments;" so their leader now judges *them, publicly,* to be "*rogues*" who have no "good opinion of the law" of God. We think, at this time, the readers of that paper might study to profit the parable of Jotham, Judges 9.: 7-15.

The words taken from the "*English writer*" are a garbled extract. Dr. Lees had been describing the careful and thorough manner in which he had investigated the subject of *immortality,* and its connections; his mind having been previously perplexed on the question. He says;—

"I compared the English version with the originals, always having my Hebrew and Greek Concordances before me, for the sake of readier reference to parallel Text and Context. The issue *you* will have anticipated. It opened out another volume of priestly frauds and forgeries, to be added to an already crowded catalogue. I rose up from my perusal, perfectly satisfied that the doctrines of the Fire-Hell and its *Eternal Torments,* of the *self-subsisting* Soul and its *Immor-*

tality, were senseless fictions, totally discountenanced by the SCRIPTURES, at any rate. This was to me a mighty relief—and I felt, for the first time, *fully* competent to defend Christianity, both from the fangs of Infidelity, and the corruptions of Priestcraft. I had now the highest assurance of the Truth—Creation and Scripture were in harmony."

It will thus be seen, that the "mighty relief" Dr. Lees experienced, was from the difficulty of "*defending* christianity," while he admitted the "*immortality and endless torment*" FABLE. That once proved to be a falsehood is a "mighty relief" to any man who undertakes to defend a pure christianity.

In conclusion, we would say to Dr. Lee, of North Carolina, that Priests have always been the greatest enemies to any truth that endangers their fine creeds and disciplines. With few, and rare exceptions, they are the last to engage in the investigation of any subject that may render them unpopular. "How can ye believe who receive honor one of another?" Many of them will misrepresent whatever we do or say; and the people have had such blind confidence in them, that they repeat any such slander as if it were true. We must bear these things as patiently as we can, tho' we may refute their slanders.

PROPHECY OF ZECHERIAH.

One of our exchange papers says: "Perhaps none of the prophecies have occasioned so much embarrassment in the student's mind, as that of Zecheriah, particularly the 14th chapter."

We know it is very *embarrassing* to all those that attempt to establish a theory that is at war with that chapter—such as that there is no probation to any body after the second advent of our Lord, and that all, not then converted, will immediately be destroyed from the earth. Mr. Miller, and those who still adhere to his theory, have tried, and are trying in vain to harmonise not only Zech. 14th, but a multitude of other prophecies to their *scheme*.

The paper referred to, wishes to overcome the embarrassment by assuming that Zecheriah is a very "allegorical" writer, though his "similes and figures are so connected with undoubted matter of fact, as to be distinctly apprehended;" and it says, "the clear and distinct must govern and explain the figurative." Very well: and what then? Why, says the editor of the aforesaid paper, "We venture to affirm that Zech. 14 presents no scenery beyond the coming of Christ and the judgment." In reply, we venture to affirm that it does "present scenes beyond the second *coming* of Christ"—the judgment is another matter. But we shall see how that paper makes out its theory. It says, "This prophecy was uttered before the second building of Jerusalem and the temple." We deny that Zech. 14th was written before the building of the second *temple*. The difference in the chronology between Zech. 1st and 14th is twenty years. Zech. 1st is placed in the *second* year of Darius, and the temple was finished in the *sixth* year of the same king; see Ezra 6: 15; so that Zech. 14th was fourteen years after the temple was finished. The aforesaid paper says: After preaching the rebuilding of Jerusalem, together with the deliverance of Israel, the prophet's eye descries in the distance the first Advent of Christ, and presents him under the symbol of a branch." Yes, brother, and the "prophet's eye" reached a long way beyond that, to the time when, "*Saith the Lord of Hosts, I will* REMOVE THE INIQUITY *of that land in one day*:" an event which has never yet taken place, but which the "prophet's eye" saw, though the eyes of the enemies of the return of Jacob's posterity cannot see.

The writer next says: "In Zech. 4, Christ is evidently presented between the two dispensations—between the Jewish and Gospel church—the two houses of Israel proper under the name of Zerubbabel:" and adds, "Before him (or the church, if you please so understand it,) is a mountain, that shall become a PLAIN." *We* do not "please so understand it," and consider it an unwarrantable *assumption:* nor is there any evidence in that chapter that "Christ is presented between the two dispensations;" that, in our "opinion," is all pure *fancy;* nor is that all of this writer's fancy; the most marvellous is still to come: he says—"This mountain can be none other than the kingdom of Israel; that theocracy must be demolished, or the gospel can never be advanced." If he will carefully examine the *history* with the prophecy, he will see, we think, that his theory, and the theory of Mr. Miller on Zech. 4 is all pure fancy. Zerubbabel was the Governor sent to Jerusalem by Cyrus to rebuild the temple, and is the same person called Sheshbazzar in Ezra 1: 8, 11, which compare with Ezra 2: 2 and 3: 2, 8; and with Haggai 1: 1, 14. Zerubbabel commenced building the tempel, under the decree of Cyrus, soon after his arrival at Jerusalem. Please read the whole of Ezra 3. After the work had gone forward a while, the "adversaries of Judah and Benjamin" set themselves to work to weaken the hands of Zerubbabel, and to prevent the accomplishment of the work; and in this they were, for some years, too successful; and after a time the work was "made to cease," for a while: see Ezra 4, throughout. But in the second year of Darius the work was again put forward: see Ezra 4: 24, and 5: 1, 2; Haggai, throughout; and Zech. 1: 1, 7, 12, 16. By the hindrances [*mountain*, brother,] that Zerubbabel had experienced, it seems he felt great discouragement; and now when he was directed to commence the work anew, the Lord was pleased to encourage his heart by a message from the prophet Zecheriah, chapter 4, in which the prophet had first represented to his mind the completion of the temple by the candlestick of gold with its bowl, pipes, &c., which was an indication of the opening of the temple service, and hence showed that it was completed. Then, when the prophet had seen this, he was directed to speak to Zerubbabel, the Governor, to encourage his mind, and assured him that the work should be accomplished by the special intervention of the Lord himself, so that what was to Zerubbabel a "great mountain" should "become a plain:" and "the word of the Lord came unto" Zecheriah saying, "The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundations of this house; [see Ezra 3: 8–13] his [Zerubbabel's] hands shall *also* finish it," &c. This is God's own interpretation. To make Zerubbabel "*the church*," and the mountain "the *kingdom of Israel*" is spiritualising with a vengeance.

That writer next says—"Whatever else the prophet teaches, from chapter 4 to 7, he still dwells upon the first advent, as appears in verse 12." He does not tell us in what chapter "verse 12" is. If he means verse 12 of chapter 6, then the 13th verse shows that the prophet looks *beyond* the first

advent; for he says, "The man whose name is The BRANCH, shall *sit* and *rule upon his throne*," &c., which he has not yet done; and he does not sit upon it till he comes the second time—"*Then* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory:" then "shall the Lord God give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever," &c. Yea, brother, "and he shall be a *Priest* upon his throne;" Zech. 6: 13; so you see it looks as if the dreadful thing, "probation after the second advent," might be continued to *some body*.

Our friend says, the prophet has not "left the scenes of the first advent in chapter 9, as appears from verse 9." We reply, neither has he left the scenes of the second advent as appears from the 10th verse of the same chapter: "His dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river [Euphrates] to the ends of the earth." Has that prophecy its fulfilment this side the second advent? We are satisfied it has not; and that is the day, remember, where the scenes of Zech. 14 are laid, when "the Lord shall be king over all the earth;" 14: 9.

The next attempt of our brother is to fix Zech. 12th all at the first advent, or immediately after. A strange undertaking, truly. "*In that day*," the Lord says, not only that he "will make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all people," but, that "all that burden themselves with it shall be cut in pieces," &c. Surely that did not take place at the first advent; for the Romans were not only not "cut in pieces," *in that day*, but they cut Jerusalem and its people in pieces. "The Governors of Judah," *in that day*, did not "devour all the people round about," &c.; and "Jerusalem" was not inhabited again in her own place, even in Jerusalem," *in that day* of, at, or near, the time of her "siege" by the Romans. *In that day* "the Lord" *did not* "save the tents of Judah first," nor at all. *In that day* "the Lord" *did not* "defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem." *In that day*, of the *first* advent, "the Lord *did not*, "seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem." Now, as this writer says, "The same day or season is constantly kept in view throughout this chapter," we further affirm—*In that day*, of the first advent, there was not *the* "great mourning" spoken of in that chapter; for, that mourning is to be in the "day or season" when the "Lord shall seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem," verse 9, and when he "shall defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem;" and that is *in the day* when he "shall go forth and fight against those nations," &c., and when "the Lord my God shall come and all the saints with thee," Zech. 14: 3, 5; THEN *in that day* of his second coming, shall the remnant of the Jews, who remain after the awful calamities with which *that day* is ushered in, "look on" him "whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn," &c. "*In that day* shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem," &c. Not the mourning of despair, but after the "*pattern*" of Saul of Tarsus when he fell to the ground on *seeing* the Lord Jesus on his way to Damascus, and was three days sorrowing, mourning, and praying, till Ananias was sent to him with the message to "arise and be baptised, and *wash away* thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord;" *in that day* was "*opened*" to Saul of Tarsus, the blaspheming Jew, "a fountain for sin and uncleanness:" *then* opened to him because he had not previously seen it—he had been blinded—and in the same way will there "be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem" *in that day* in which they, as Saul of Tarsus did, shall "see the Lord," and "mourn" for their past rejection of him and blasphemy against him. Saul "was a blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious; but," says he, "I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief;" 1 Tim. 1: 13. In the same way, and for a similar reason, will the remnant of the Jews, Paul's "kinsmen, according to the flesh," [Rom. 9: 3] obtain mercy. Paul adds, 1 Timothy 1: 15, 16, "Of" sinners "I am chief. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first [the type] Jesus Christ might show forth all long-suffering for a *pattern* to them which should *hereafter* believe on him to life everlasting." So far as the manner of Paul's conversion is concerned none will pretend he is a pattern to any soul of man that ever has yet been turned to the Lord: he "saw the Lord," and was as "one born out of due time;" 1 Corth. 15: 8. So will God magnify his grace in Judah's conversion "at the appearing of Christ;" and they, like their prototype, Saul of Tarsus, will "wash away their sins" in "a fountain opened" to their minds, for the first time, *in that day*. Who ever "imagined" there was to be "*another* fountain opened at the close of the present age" than the one opened by Christ? Can our brother Editor tell us? The opening the fountain *by* Christ is one thing; the opening it *to* the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem is quite another matter. When they come to see it, it is *then* opened or made manifest *to them*.

Our exchange paper says—"That in all the foregoing chapters [from the 13th backward] the church are not carried beyond the scenes of the first advent," &c. Let the reader judge if we have not shown clearly the contrary.

The Editor of that paper seems shocked at the idea, as a strange "anomoly," that "redeemed immortals" should ever be "preaching to mortal-dying heathens," &c. Does not the brother believe that angels visited Abraham, Lot, and others, and conversed with them? Still more—does he not believe that the only begotten Son of God, by whom he made the worlds, came down to this earth and dwelt among mortal beings many years? that he even laid down his *life* among, and for mortal beings—and after his resurrection still remained among mortal beings forty days teaching and instructing them? All this he believes, we presume. Is the *disciple* above his Lord? If our Saviour has done these things, is it either impossible, improbable, or unlikely that his immortal saints may be *among*, *teach*, and *rule over* mortal beings? Shall we say, "any thing" is "too hard for God?" If God has said it shall be so, is not that sufficient to satisfy faith? And what, we pray, are the saints, when made immortal, to be "*kings*" over, and "*priests*" to, during their reign with Christ on the earth? Who, if not those that are "*left* of the nations," *after* the "Lord my God shall come and all the saints with" him?

The idea that mortal and immortal beings *cannot* dwell together is founded in prejudice—is unscriptural, and subversive of the Christian faith. It limits the power of God—and makes our weak judgments the rule to determine what God *can* or *will* do. If he pleases to have it so, it can be

done. The only thing that faith asks is the *proof* that God has said it. That point settled, *faith* "staggers not," but is "strong, giving glory to God."

Communicated by Dr. Lees, Leeds, England.

ON THE RESURRECTION.

The following is Dr. Lees' Reply to a request to give his opinion on Matt. 22: 31, 32, which some suppose conflicts with the view of the *sleep* of the dead.

With pleasure I give my opinion on the Resurrection—the grand and astonishing peculiarity of Christ's reward—first placing before me the record of the *three* evangelists. In order to puzzle our Lord, 'the Sadducēs, who say *that there is no resurrection*, questioned him, concerning the wife of the seven brethren.' The following was Christ's answer, which 'put the Sadducēs to silence.'

(1) "Ye err, not knowing THE SCRIPTURES, NOR THE POWER of God, Matt. xxii. 29.

(2) "The children of *this age* (*aionos*) marry, and are given in marriage: but those who *shall be accounted worthy* to obtain *that age*, EVEN THE RESURRECTION FROM OUT THE DEAD, neither marry, nor are given in marriage; *nor can they die any more*, for they are angelic, and children of God, being sons of the resurrection, *anastaseos*, Luke xx. 34-6.

(3) "But concerning *the resurrection* of the dead [Matthew],—[or] as touching the dead *that they rise*, [Mark],—[or] that the dead *are raised, egeirontai*, [Luke].

(4) "Have ye not read, in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?' Mark xii. 26.

(5) "Now he is not the God of *the dead*, but of *the living*: for all live *unto Him*. Luke xxi. 38.

(6) "Ye therefore do greatly err. Mark xii. 27.

(7) "And when the multitude heard, they were *astonished* at his teaching." Matt. xxii. 33.

The present circumstances of the world are, in many points, similar to those which existed at the *first* advent of Christ. On the one hand, we have a large class of Pharisēs believing in the separate existence and immortality of some mysterious *part of man*, 'not knowing the Scriptures,' which refute their false philosophy; and, on the other hand, we have a large class of skeptical Sadducēs, who can conceive of *no future state*, or resurrection, 'not knowing *the power of God*.' Hence, when we attempt to revive the exact doctrine of Christ—which is neither that of the Pharisēs nor Sadducēs—'the multitude are astonished.'

There is nothing in the preceding narrative which, rightly considered, conflicts with the doctrine of '*the sleep* of the dead.' Sleep implies an *awakening*—a resurrection, or *anastasis*—a standing again. Hence, when the power of God is to be *connected* with this resurrection, *literal* Death is appropriately called '*a sleep*,' for then the sleeper really does 'live unto God.' Thus our Lord spoke of Lazarus—'our friend Lazarus *sleepeth*; but I go, that I may *awake him out of sleep*,' John xi. 11. It is in this sense alone that the promise can be understood—'Whosoever believeth in me *shall never die*,' for all the good 'live unto God,' who will 'raise them out of their sleep' at the last day. In this sense, therefore, the patriarchs are in *covenant* with God. Like those who have 'fallen asleep in Christ,' they shall not die forever; God will do for them what he did for Lazarus, *awake them out of sleep*. Hence, also, the language of Paul's exhortation—'That whether we *wake* or *sleep*, we may *live* together with him.' 'Your *life* is hidden with Christ, IN GOD.'

God, 'who quickeneth the dead, and CALLETH THOSE THINGS WHICH BE NOT [yet] AS THO THEY WERE,' Rom. iv. 17, views the patriarchs, therefore, as the heirs of the covenant, '*the children of the resurrection*'; and as Christ is called '*the Lord* both of *the dead* and living,' Rom. xiv. 9, as being their sure and appointed Judge, so Jehovah is styled 'the God of the living, *for* all live [really] UNTO HIM [not unto *creatures of time*, but *unto Him*] to whom a thousand years is as one day.' Thus, too, when the object of faith rests upon the promise of the Divine Being, *future* events are spoken of as *present*. Paul speaks of *having* 'a tabernacle not made with hands, eternal *in the heavens*,' before he actually possest it; hence, also, the Hebrew Christians are said to '*have* a better and an enduring possession in *heaven*,' Heb. x. 34, and to '*have come* unto the heavenly Jerusalem,' etc., xii. 22. Because God's promise is certain and steadfast—and because his kingdom is one 'that cannot be shaken'—it is exprest by *present time*, which to us is the most *certain* of all things, Gen. ii. 17; Deut. ix. 1; xxix. 13; Psalm ii. 7; Acts xiii. 33; Heb. v. 5. *To-day* is sure—hence selected as the symbol of sureness. God 'has *prepared for* the good *a city*,' it is said; and Christ went to *prepare a place* for his disciples; but Christ has not *actually* come again to receive his disciples, nor has the heavenly Jerusalem seen by John *actually* descended. In truth, it does not exist *yet* to Man—for he lives in the *present* only—but it *does* exist UNTO GOD, for with him the future is open as the present—it is sure, because he has *decreed* it.

Having made these general observations, I observe that there are *three* modes of interpreting the gospel narrative before me. Let me consider each separately.

I. The common interpretation supposes that *the dead* are NOT THE DEAD any longer, because they live *unto God*,' who is not 'the God of the dead.'

Many fatal objections may be urged to this interpretation. As, *first*, that it does not follow, that because the patriarchs 'live *unto God*,' therefore they live *unto each other*: any more than it follows that *the dead* are *living*, because Christ is declared to be *their Lord*, [Rom. xiv. 9,] i. e., *judge*.

Second, it is opposed to the clear statement that the dead are to *live, by virtue of the Resurrection*, FROM OUT THE DEAD,' and by that means *only*: they are to assume *life then*, and not before—a future period ('*that age*') being referred to, both in this passage and many others. Abraham, then, *was dead*, and needed therefore a *resurrection* to show God's power; but if he *already* lived, he did not.

Third, the *object* of our Saviour, and which he accomplisht, was to prove 'the *resurrection from out the dead*.' But if he asserted that Abraham lived *before*, and *without* a resurrection—or that a *part* of Abraham was living in 'Adēs—how could *that* 'put the Sadducēs to silence'?

Fourth: neither can the Pharisaic and foolish teaching, that *the soul lives without* a body (as an immaterial principle and by natural consequence,) demonstrate '*the power of God*' *to raise the dead*, which the Sadducēs called in question. But this *was* de-

monstrated, and the Sanducës *were* silenced; and therefore we cannot admit the common interpretation, which represents Christ as silencing the sturdy Sadducës by an irrelevant and fallacious argument!

II. Professor BUSH holds that the Dead experience *the resurrection* at death, without any *sleep* or *interval* of repose; that they live *in spiritual bodies* without intermission.

Now this is a much more consistent and plausible view than the preceding, tho not satisfactory to my mind. It seems clear from the literal teaching of Christ and his apostles, that *the resurrection* denotes some general, simultaneous, and future event, and implies an *intermediate state* of Rest, Sleep, or temporal Death and Unconsciousness.

The context of the passage, par. 2, represents the *anastasis*, or *Renewed State*, as one not to be experienced in THIS AGE, but in A FUTURE AGE;—in that age the *good* are [to be] *raised* to incorruptible life. 'They can *die no more*.' Eternal life—an *immortal* organization—is the peculiar reward of '*the worthy*' alone; it is 'a *gift*' of 'life in Christ,' not the necessary activity of something *inherent* in our nature; not a *continued* existence of a spiritual body, by *natural* law, but a miraculous and astonishing demonstration of 'the *power* of God,' to be manifested upon those who 'die in Christ,' as it was upon Christ himself.

The Swedenborgians have sometimes placed stress upon the *present tense* of the phrase—'*are* raised.' This, however, can have meant no more than the two other phrases employed by Matthew and Mark, which are *not* in the present tense. The *essential* idea cannot have been omitted in their record. In par. 2, the transition first occurs from the future to the present, and is easily accounted for—the *antecedent* being 'THAT AGE.'

Professor BUSH, however, in translating *anastasis* by 'future life,' clears his theory from one objection alleged against the common interpretation. Christ, he argues, demonstrated from Moses *another state of life*, which the Sadducës denied, and hence, by implication, of some *living apparatus* for its display. Defeated in their *great* point—that there was *no life beyond the grave*—they would not care to argue about the *sort of bodies* which the dead possest.

III. Putting aside all pre-formed theories, however, the following seems to me the natural meaning of the narrative:

'Ye err,' Sadducës, in denying a Renewed State of Life to the dead, neither '*knowing the Scriptures*,' which promise life to the good, nor estimating aright '*the power of God*,' who is able to raise up children to Abraham out of the very stones.

Ye misconceive the *nature* of that future state, when ye question me of marriage: it is not a kingdom of 'flesh and blood,' which requires that institution for filling up the population which perishes. Where creatures *die*, they must be *born*. Therefore, 'the children of *this age* marry and are given in marriage; but those who shall be *accounted worthy* to obtain *that age*' whereof I speak, 'even the standing up of the Dead,' neither marry, nor are given in marriage,' for '*they cannot die any more*, because they are' IN THAT AGE 'like the angels in heaven.'

'AS touching the dead, *that they rise*' again, why should ye, the profest followers of Moses, deem that *incredible*? 'Have ye not read in the book of Moses, how GOD spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?' He has declared himself to be their God—that is, their Rewarder,—even after their death; but he cannot be the rewarder—the God—of the finally dead and everlastingly unconscious, but of the living and conscious only. *Now* these patriarchs are as yet numbered with the dead—with those who 'go down into silence'—with 'the dead' who 'cannot praise' God; but they still 'live *unto God*,' and THEREFORE MUST RISE AGAIN to receive their reward, for 'God is not the God of the dead,' *as such*, 'but of the living.'

And, in truth, 'God is not ashamed to be called *their God*, FOR he hath prepared for them a city.' The patriarchs sank to *sleep*, in hope of the realization of this wondrous promise; but whether this sleep was one day, or one thousand years, altered not *the fact* that God was *their* God, who had *prepared* for them a Reward, to be manifested in due time. *Then*, and not *while* they are dead, 'God himself shall be with them; AND BE THEIR GOD' (Rev.) xxi. 1, 2, 3.

FREDERICK RICHARD LEES,
Editor (British) Truth Seeker.

EUROPE AND THE JEWS.

In our humble opinion, the convulsions in Europe are not only the commencement of "the seventh vial" of "the seven last plagues," but mark the closing of "the times of the Gentiles"—the deliverance of the posterity of Jacob—their return to Palestine, preparatory to the invasion of that land by Russia and the northern powers, who are the "Gog" &c. of Ezekiel, 38th and 39th,—and the second personal advent of our Lord. But, we are waiting for further developments, before we speak with *positiveness*.

We give our readers the following *extracts* from speeches delivered at the "fortieth anniversary" of the London Society for the Jews, held at Exeter Hall, May 5th, 1848; taken from the "Jewish Intelligence."

The CHAIRMAN said,—Those very convulsions of Europe, that throw all the rest of the world into disorder, only methodize and forward the great work in which you are engaged. If there are kingdoms to be overturned, are there no kingdoms to be restored? And if the times of the Gentiles are drawing to a close, is it not possible that the times of the Hebrews are about to be revived? There is one other matter of rejoicing on this present occasion, and it is an important matter. You have obtained the recognition, by the Ottoman Porte, of Protestants as a distinct and constituent part of the subjects of the Ottoman Empire. They now stand upon the same footing as the Greek, the Armenian, and the Latin Churches. And this is one of the first fruits that you have derived from the appointment of a Protestant bishop; because, such is the rule of the Ottoman dominion, that they will recognize no sect or body that is not represented by some responsible head. You have obtained that responsible head in the present Bishop of Jerusalem. You have obtained the full, complete and absolute recognition of the protestants as a distinct, separate and acknowledged portion of the Ottoman empire.

The Hon. W. Cowper, M. P. said,—I find great reason for encouragement in the cause which we are met to speak of to-day, from the present aspect of the Continent of Europe. In the Report it was mentioned, that the Austrian government had been able to prohibit one of our missionaries from continuing his exertions in that part of Poland which is under the dominion of Austria. The Austrian government has always been a great opponent of missionary efforts among the Jews, as well as of all Protestant efforts. But that proud government has found that it is a hard thing to strive against the Lord's work. That government is now shivered and shaken, and may at any moment fall asunder into a variety of parts; and the statesman, so renowned for sagacious policy, who has been so long at the head of that government, directing this severe, arbitrary, exclusive and persecuting policy, is now an outcast and refugee, finding an asylum in this city in which we are assembled. The state of Europe gives freer access to the missionaries of this Society, wherever they may wish to seek out the lost and benighted Jews. And at this moment, when we see so much gloom hanging over all the nations of Europe—when they are shaking with apprehensions of civil discords, wars and tumults; when they scarcely know what to look for on the coming day; when in all directions "men's hearts are failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth,"—when, over all the nations of Europe, I say, this gloom is hanging, I see that the prospects of one nation, and that the despised nation of the Jews alone, are brightening. While the sun of prosperity appears to be setting over so many other nations, it appears to be rising over the Jewish nation. In Germany, already, we see Jews occupying high stations. The prejudices that have hitherto ground down the Jews into the dust, are now fast dissipating. In France, we see every career opening to the Jews. We see them filling the most distinguished positions. Among that small cabinet that has been governing France, there were two Jews. Even at Rome itself, the prejudice against Jews, and the persecution of them, are passing away. Even in that strong-hold of persecution, where alone the Inquisition still raises its gloomy head, and by the instrumentality of the Pope himself, there has been indulgence extended to the Jews.

The Rev. Hugh Stowell said,—I feel great pleasure, my Lord, in seconding the resolution Mr. Tottenham has submitted. You will have been struck with the manner in which the minds both of the speakers, and of the hearers, seem to have been profoundly impressed, as to the critical position in which our christian land is placed, and the fearful and emphatic character of the signs of the times in which we live. It has been brought against the Exeter Hall agitators, for such they are reckoned, that they have been needless alarmists, and have been crying out "The wolf! the wolf!" till they have disturbed nervous persons; but the wolf has never come. We would retort, not in the spirit of uncharitableness or anger, but in the spirit of brotherly love—we would retort upon those who have so charged the speakers of Exeter Hall, "when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child, and they shall not escape." In the high places of the national assembly, the cuckoo note was resounding full and clear, "Peace, peace and safety:" when all at once, with the suddenness of the lightning's flash, Europe was shaken to her centre, and the dynasty of France was crumbled into dust. My Lord, it is a dangerous thing to be needlessly alarmed, but it is a no less dangerous thing not to be alarmed when it is needed. It does not do for the seaman to set about studying his chart, when his ship is getting among the rocks, or to reef the sails when the tempest is rushing into her shrouds. And very much the same would be the conduct of the Christian mariner, if he were to look into the chart of unfulfilled prophecy only, when its fulfilment has taken place; and if he were to begin to look for the breakers and the reefs and shoals, just when his vessel was grounding on the shoals, or dashing to pieces amongst the rocks. My Lord, if prophecy is given us, as assuredly it is, to be, after its accomplishment, one of the firmest buttresses and pillars of our Christian faith, it is no less given us to be the light shining in the dark distant future, and to which we do well to take heed. And though it shines in the darkness, and discovers not the surrounding features of the scenery, yet are we therefore not to fix our eyes upon it, as the ancient mariner did upon the polar star that was to guide him safe to his haven? Are we not to mark that bright light shining far off—a herald and pledge of the "dayspring from on high" that shall illumine and visit us? My Lord, I conceive that an attentive and calm view of unfulfilled prophecy, is admirably calculated, when taken in conjunction with the stirring signs of the times, to give us counsel on the one hand, and comfort on the other; for those things which make the people of this world afraid, make the Christian look up and lift up his head, because his redemption draweth nigh.

. . . Allow me to say, that though the Jew's Society is merely a Society for promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, yet it is scarcely possible not to throw round the Jewish cause a little of that halo of splendour which prophecy ever associates with Jerusalem. It is impossible for us not to do so; because it is impossible for us to study closely the Jewish subject, and not see that it *is* as clear that Israel shall be restored, as it *was* clear that she should be dispersed. The prophecies will be as literally fulfilled in the last case, as they have been in the first. If you ask a child in our schools, where is the country without a people, and the people without a country? he will answer, the country is Judea, and the people are the Jews. Judea is the lodging-house of all nations. There you may meet, as in the great centre of the world, the wandering Arab, the classic Greek, the whiskered Turk, and the fair-faced European; and there you may meet a little band of Jews, with their bishop at their head. You may meet all these; but none can say, We are the inhabitants of this land. They are all, as it were, tenants at will, waiting for their notice to quit. And if the land is thus waiting for its people, the people are waiting for their land. Wherever the Jews are to be found, they are a distinct people—they are everywhere found as oil upon the waters—nowhere combined. And God, who has preserved them, will bring them again to their land, and will unite Judah and Israel together, as one, for ever. My Christian friends, and is it not deeply interesting, at the present juncture, to look to Jerusalem and to the Jews? I, for one, look upon the present events but as the "beginning of the end." I look upon those wars, and rumours of wars, that have filled Europe with

alarm,—I look upon those earthquakes of nations—but as the first distant moanings of the tempest that is gathering and thickening, and that will break upon us with all its terrors. I look upon all these events that are taking place around us, but as the first outpourings of the seventh vial. Then, assuredly, Jerusalem must be the beacon to which we are to turn our eyes, and the Jew the star to which we are to direct our expectations. I am looking, with deep and earnest desire, to see the first heaving and moving of the scattered Jewish people, preparatory to their returning to their own land. And I believe the missionaries can already see, as in Ezekiel's vision of the bones, bone beginning to come to its bone. And already we may hear some distant sound shaking among the bones, in the mighty valley of vision. And I believe that as the outburst of judgment has been sudden, so the outburst of hope for Judah will be sudden, too. Who can tell that by the time we shall assemble here to commemorate another anniversary of this Society—who, I ask, can tell whether the Jews may not be gathered together as a mighty army, and be setting forward on their journey to their own land, conveyed, perhaps, by the ships of Shittim, our own wooden walls. O, that England may be the favoured instrument in this great work, instead of America, her daughter, or any other youthful competitor for the prize! I have good hope for England. I believe we are doing what the prophet was bid to do, to go forth in spite of the sneer of the worldly wise, and the contempt of the unbeliever, and to prophesy on the mighty outspread multitude of dry bones, until a mighty army shall arise. And let us remember the words we heard last night, from one of our most eloquent and most energetic bishops, that "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

We commend the following fable to the attention of those who seem to think, no one has any right to do or get good, unless it is done according to their sectarian organisation; and especially to those who would prevent us from drawing consolation and truth from the pure stream,—the Bible,—without their *growling*, as if they were the only "authorized expounders" at that fountain.

THE LAMB, THE WOLF, AND THE DOG.

A FABLE: BY G. S. PHILLIPS.

A little lamb once left its mother and went down the mountain, to drink at a stream which ran below. At the same moment, a wolf came out of the neighboring wood, and faced the lamb, on the opposite bank.

'What right have you to drink here,' quoth the wolf; 'Don't you know this stream belongs to me?'

'Am I doing wrong?' askt the innocent lamb; 'I thought the stream was free to all, and did not know that you were the owner of it.'

'Don't stand lying there,' said the wolf, pretending to be very angry.

'I do not tell a lie,' answered the little lamb; 'I was very thirsty when I came down the mountain, and am sorry if I have offended you by drinking of the stream.'

'Your sorrow won't prevent me from killing you,' replied the wolf; 'so prepare yourself to die!'

'I have no preparation to make,' said the lamb. 'All my life has been as innocent as that of the flowers in the meadows.'

'So then,' said the wolf, 'you will make a dainty meal for me'; and he jumpt over the stream, whilst the lamb lifted up its eyes to heaven, and stood ready to be sacrificed.

At this instant, the faithful sheep-dog came bounding down the mountain, and confronted the wolf. 'How now, old rascal!' quoth he: 'Do you seek to kill one of my master's stray lambs, by pretending to own the stream wherein he has slaked his thirst? This is one of your ancient tricks, which you must now answer for without loss of time.'

'Pardon me,' quoth the wolf, crouching with a vulpine smile; "I meant the little lamb no harm, I merely wanted to try her courage.'

'Try thy own conrage against mine then,' answered the brave sheep-dog; and with that he fell upon the cowardly wolf, and tore him to pieces.

The little lamb uttered sorrowful cries, like the wailing of an orphan in some alien world, and again lifted up its meek eyes to heaven, and saw the face of Jupiter looking out of the clouds, smiling and well pleased.

Then the dog and the lamb walkt up the mountain together towards the fold.

INTERPRETATION.

Dear to heaven is innocence.
Ever ready its defense.

Tho a moment, seems the Wronger
Over Right to triumph stronger,

There are angels evermore,
At the theshold of God's door;

Swift to fly, and strong to do
Justice, all the wide world thrö.

Thou art safe in self-possession.
Innocence needs no confession.
Guilt lies only in transgression.

Hold thy heart in quiet keeping;
Evil sowing, evil reaping;—
The master's eyes are never sleeping.

Fear not therefore, tho there be
No sign of ready help for thee;
But in thy peril and distress,
Trust the master, questionless.

FROM DR. LEES.—THE "ADDENDA."

In 1833 Mr. THOM, of Liverpool, formerly minister of the Scotch Church, published a strange book, entitled "Calvinism identified with Universalism," which found some disciples. He is a man of learning and talent, but, as I think, led away by an idealess crotchet, viz.: that the *human nature* is *totally and eternally destroyed* first, and yet somehow the *consciousness is finally restored!* This was afterwards elaborated in various works, but chiefly, as regards your topic, into "the three questions."

In 1840, Mr. Carmichael, of Dublin, published his "Disquisitions on the Theology and Metaphysics of Scripture," which display great ability and research, and which, I believe, were somewhat influential in spreading views not dissimilar to your own. I refer particularly to the six chapters of the 7th Disquisition.

LIST OF WORKS ADVOCATING THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WICKED,

SENT US BY DR. LEES, LEEDS, ENGLAND.

1. *Three Questions, Proposed and Answered*, concerning the Life forfeited by Adam, the Resurrection of the Dead, and Eternal Punishment, By *Rev. David Thom*, second edition, enlarged.
2. *The Philosophy of Man*, by *John Osborne*.
3. *Scripture Revelations*, by a *Country Pastor*.
4. *The Future States:* their nature and evidences considered, on principles physical, moral, and Scriptural, by *Reginald Courtenay*, M. A. Rector of Thornton Watlass, Yorkshire.
5. *Scriptural Doctrine of Future Punishment*, by *H. H. Dobney*, second edition.
6. *Life of Christ*, by *Edward White*, Hereford.
7. *A Tract on Future Punishment*, Chapman, London.
8. *The Evangel of Love;* interpreted by *Henry Sutton*.
9. *Human Nature:* or, the Law of Reward and Punishment, illustrated on Philosophic principles.
10. *Disquisitions on the Theology and Metaphysics of Soripture*, by *Andrew Carmichael*, M. R. I. A [Member of Royal Irish Academy.] Two Vols.

Some of the above works we have sent for, and from their pages hope to be able to enrich the Examiner, and give our readers matter on these topics which they are not likely to obtain from any other source. In thus seeking matter for our columns, our expenses are increased. Will our friends see that we are sustained by increasing the circulation of the Examiner.

DR. LEE, OF N. C.—The Sermon on "*Profit and Loss*" we shall publish in the Examiner just as soon as we can find room. At present, we have none to send you; much obliged for your favour.

LETTERS.

SALUTATION FROM BR. ALBERT ANDERSON, Athens, Va. :—

TO THE BRETHREN BELOVED, GEO. STORRS AND J. T. WALSH, Editors of Bible Examiner:—The Bible Examiner is to *me* a paper both *interesting*, on account of the *kindly* spirit of its communications, and *edifying*, because it sustains a *character* in harmony with its *name;* I do not mean to say, that it is perfect; but, I mean to express myself pleased with it, *generally*. If it continues its noble and independent course of *investigation*, we have many and strong reasons for *believing* that God Almighty will bless *it*, and make it a *blessing*. It appears to me, admirably calculated to increase the *love* of *Bible study* where it exists already, and to produce *it* where it has not hitherto existed.

Please accept the assurance of my Christian regard and love; and believe me yours in the hope of the *Son of God* from heaven.

The "$5" is received, and the *Sermons* are sent. Thank you, brother.—[ED. EX.

BR. JONATHAN WILSON, under date of Sept. 15th writes :—

BR. STORRS:—I fully endorse your views of the state of the Dead—the Destruction of the Wicked, and the Sonship of Christ.

I have been travelling among the Advent believers for four months. In which time I have visited Buffalo, Lockport, Rochester, Victor, Canandaigua, Utica and Albany, N. Y.; North Adams, Springfield, Three Rivers, Worcester, Wrentham and Attleboro, Mass.; Providence, North Situate, Coventry, Warwick and Bristol, R. I.; New Bedford, Boston and South Reading, Mass. With the exception of Boston and South Reading, from the information I have obtained in these places—and I have preached in all of them—there are 18 out of 20 who are with you in sentiment on the above named points.

BR. JOHN C. LOYD, Shippensburg, Pa., writes :—

BR. STORRS:—I love the Bible Examiner. It uproots the foolish notion of immortal-soul-ism. One of my Christian neighbours undertook to convert me from my "error" about the sleep of the dead. I lent him your pamphlet on that subject, and that "converted" *him* from all the foolery of going to judgment at death and a world unknown.

SISTER BEULAH STOW, Weybridge. Vt., writes :—

BR. STORRS:—I read the Examiner with interest. It comforts and refreshes my soul; and stirs me up to seek more earnestly for *immortality, eternal life;* and to escape (*not* "that death that never dies," but) "everlasting destruction" of "soul and body," which, I firmly believe, will be the doom of all those who "obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." May the Lord give success to your labours in scattering light and truth through our land.

SISTER CATHARINE C. WILLIAMS, Beaver Dams, N. Y., Sept. '48, writes :—

BR. STORRS:—Though strangers to you, yet claiming fraternity, on the ground of unanimity of sentiment, we address you, thinking it must be a matter of encouragement to you, to know what your little messenger, in the form of "Six Sermons," is accomplishing, and has been instrumental of accomplishing for us. I am writing for myself, and in behalf of a sister believer, who, with me, was led to searching the Bible for ourselves, by means of your Sermons, to see whether those things were so. By submitting to the guidance of the Spirit, instead of creeds, we were led to renounce immortal-soul-ism, and embrace the Bible doctrine of immortality, as being the gift of God, attainable through Christ alone.

Some little time since, a friend presented us with two numbers of the "Bible Examiner," and, as they exactly met our views, we were anxious to take them, and to aid in their circulation.

BR. ANSON WALKER, New York City, writes :

BR. STORRS:—I think I will in no case be without the Examiner so long as I have money for any other purpose, besides buying bread, after which time I will beg it. It is a most welcome visiter. In my judgment its influence to convince those who read it, of the power of prejudice and sectarianism is mighty; for, the scriptural, incontrovertible, and vital truths that are presented, and scripturally defended in the Examiner, palsy and deaden their force against you. I have to look to some other cause why the opponents of these truths do not embrace them than *scripture, consistency* or *reason;* and when you have taken from them these three, what excuse have they for continuing to oppose, except it be the power of sectarian influence and prejudice. * * * * * * * * * *

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER, 1848. No. 11.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

THE MIND.—REPLY TO J. T. WALSH.

This gentleman declares I neither understand *him* nor his subject. Whether I understand *him*, he may decide; whether I understand the subject, our *readers* may. He says he neither believes nor teaches that the mind and brain are *identical*, and refers me, in proof, to his previous articles on file; but in one published in No. 7, I find the following passages:

"But we shall doubtless be told, that although the brain is the instrument of the mind, nevertheless *it is not the mind*, and that, therefore, our argument fails."

"This objection introduces another question. '*What is the mind?*' The objector replies, *the mind is the spirit*, the agent which operates *upon* the brain developing thought and reason. Thus mind is defined to be an independent and separate *entity*, possessing all the attributes of intelligence, and possessing all the phenomena of an intellectual and moral character." (*Vol.* 3, *No.* 7.)

Against this view that the mind is a separate *entity*, acting *upon* the brain, he proceeds to present a variety of objections, and succeeds in his own opinion, doubtless, in showing its absurdity, leaving me to infer, as I think justly, that he considered the brain and mind *identical*.

He now declares he does not, but believes "the *mind an effect, an aggregate of powers, as functions developed* by the brain."

Again he says, "the *brain* and the *mind* stand in the relation of *cause* and *effect*."

Mind is the *effect* of a cause—*brain*. *Brain* develops *thought*, the *brain* develops *mind*, *mind* is the *effect* of *brain*—it *is an aggregate of powers*.

Such are Mr. W.'s definitions of mind. Let us look at them. And first, do they give us any idea as to *what* the mind *is*, whether *matter* or spirit? Do they give us to understand that the mind is an entity? But one thing they do do, they teach us that the brain is the *cause* of mind; that mind was not created directly by God, but is produced by man's physical organization, and depends upon that for its existence.

"The brain *develops thought*." What are we to understand by this? That the brain thinks? Such would be the natural conclusion, but that would make the *brain* and mind identical, which Mr. W. neither "believes nor teaches."

"The brain *develops* mind," is the cause of mind—thus the brain precedes the mind, and as all effects correspond to the causes, physical causes producing physical effects, the mind is physical, and if it be an entity distinct from the brain, then the brain has produced a physical *substance* called mind! Where is it? Why don't anatomists examine it?

What is that mind, the "*effect* of the *brain?*" Is it something, or nothing? Is it an agent, and does it perform actions? Does it exist any where, but in the imagination of the writer?

"*It is an aggregate of powers.*" These powers are *reason*, will, memory, conscience, &c. Powers are mere capabilities of doing certain things. Reason, for instance, is the power to reason.

Now these powers belong to something to which we may refer them. What is it? If the brain, then that is the *mind*. But Mr. W. don't believe nor teach that.

Memory is not the mind any more than inertia is matter, but it is a capacity of mind. Thought is not mind, but the *action* of mind. As well might you define God to be an *aggregate of powers*, as the mind. In this view, to speak of the *powers* of the *mind*, is absurd, for the mind is *an aggregate of powers*. The more I look at these definitions, the more confused and unsatisfactory they appear to me.

I find something in man that thinks, reasons, judges. I ask Mr. W. what it is, and he replies the brain *develops thought*. But does the brain think; is that the mind? No, says Mr. W. again, the brain *develops mind*.

I again ask what is the mind when developed by the brain, and am told *an aggregate of powers*.

But powers are the powers of something; the power to reason, to will, are among this aggregate; to what shall I refer them? They are developed, according to this gentleman, by the brain, and hence to this must be referred; and this brings us back to our starting point; the brain is the mind; for that which possesses the power of volition and reason, is doubtless the mind.

All his reasoning leads directly to this conclusion:

The brain is a part of our physical organization, designed for the production of thought, as truly as the nerves of sensation. In the infant there is no mind. But as the brain matures, it becomes capable of producing thought, and develops certain powers, mental and moral; and these powers thus produced by the brain, constitute the *mind*, which is nothing but certain powers of the *brain*.

A power of the brain is a capability of the brain, and again we come round to our starting point.

Suppose I was to define matter to be *an aggregate of properties;* should I not be pressed with the question, is there no substance to which these properties belong? And what are powers but the powers of something? Neither powers nor pro-

perties exist abstractly from some entity to which they belong.

I have devoted the main part of this article to the great point in dispute, the existence of mind as a distinct entity from the brain; but there are several minor points introduced which deserve some attention.

He says *I* regard the new birth as wholly physical. By no means. That is *his* position. If man is wholly physical, then the new birth is wholly physical. Then "that which is born of the Spirit is flesh." So thought Nicodemus, so thinks Mr. W., but Christ declares it is not flesh, but SPIRIT!

Mr. W. declares it is *man*, composed of flesh, blood, bones, nerves and brain, who is the subject of the new birth. Now he either means that this flesh, blood, bones, &c., are changed by the new birth, or he does not.

If he does, here is the flesh born again, and we might ask what chemical change is produced in the blood in regeneration? If he does not, he believes it confined to the mind, here called man, and hence his play upon this word is done to cast up a breast-work for security.

Several of his logical conclusions are not very alarming. Take the following:

"It is the immortal soul that reasons, is enlightened, saved, &c. But some men, such as idiots and monomaniacs cannot reason. Ergo: They have no immortality, and cannot be the subjects of redemption."

But Mr. W. tells us the Spirit operates through the gospel, and moves to action by its motives and arguments, addressed to the *reason* and moral *sentiments*.

"But some men, such as diots," &c., have no reason to be addressed, no moral sentiments to be appealed to. Let Mr. W. meet his own difficulties.

The immortal soul thinks; beasts think. Therefore beasts are immortal. This is a favourite resort. When pressed, we are asked if we believe beasts immortal?

The fact that there is a spirit in man, does not, of itself, aside from the will of God, secure immortality. Angels depend upon God as well as men.

And while nothing indicates that beasts were designed for endless being, every thing teaches this of man. Into the Bible argument I do not propose to go in this article; but the text "fear not them that kill the body, but are not *able* to kill the soul," receives this singular interpretation: Fear not them that can kill the present life, but are not *able* to kill the future life. Thus soul and body have the same radical meaning, *life*. Whereas they refer to entities.

But, it is added, fear him who is able, not only like man to kill the body, but to destroy both soul and body in *hell*. I must close this long article, and will do so by expressing a sincere desire for the welfare of my unknown opponent.

WM. H. BREWSTER.

LOWELL, Oct. 1, 1848.

REPLY TO W. H. BREWSTER.

I am willing with friend Brewster, to refer *his* understanding of the subject to our "readers." And I wish our "readers," to observe and remember, that Mr. B. has failed to answer the arguments submitted in my last. After stating my position, as previously expressed, he adds—"leaving me (himself) to infer, as I think justly, that he (I) considered the brain and mind *identical*." Having disavowed any such absurd position as his "inference;" and in as much as no such "inference" can be logically drawn from my position, I leave it as unworthy of further notice.

But, for his sake, I will further illustrate my views of this matter. Because the human mind is manifested or developed by the brain, does it, therefore, follow that that which *develops* and that which is *developed* are the *same*? If this be *his* logic, it is not *mine!* Because the *sense* of *sight* is developed by the *optic apparatus*, or organ, does it follow that the *organ of sight* and *sight itself* are "identical?" And because the *auditory apparatus* as a whole, is the organ of *sound*, does it follow that that *apparatus* and *sound* are one and the *same*? Can not the gentleman distinguish between an *organ* and its *function*? Can not Mr. B. distinguish between the *brain* and its *functions*? Really, I am astonished!

But, after getting through with my definitions, he asks: "Do they give us any idea as to *what* the mind *is*, whether *matter* or *spirit*?" I give my first answer—*the mind* is *an aggregate of powers*, or *functions* OF AN INTELLECTUAL OR MENTAL CHARACTER. And I care not whether Mr. Brewster makes these *intellectual powers or functions* "matter or spirit;" they are such *powers* or *functions* as have no *consciousness*, apart from the living man, by whose brain they are "developed."

The human *mind*, human *thought*, human *intellect*, of *itself*, has no *consciousness*—this latter is an attribute of *the* MAN, and not of his *thoughts*, and hence, when a *man* dies, his "*thoughts* PERISH." The *five senses*, as they are termed, are, by all philosophers, called *intellectual*. Is *sound* "matter or spirit?" Is *sight* "matter or spirit?" Is the *shade* of a living tree "matter or spirit?" Ah! this word "*matter!*" It surely was not a fit thing out of which to form "*a living soul!*" But, nevertheless, God did "form man of the dust of the earth, and breathe into his *nostrils* the *breath* of life!"—another *material* thing! —"and he became a living soul."

What does my friend understand by a distinct "*entity?*" Does he mean that which has a separate and independent existence? Not independent of God, but of other beings? The *soul* of man is not such an "entity;" the *mind* of man is not such either; but MAN, *himself*, is such a being. Again, Mr. B. quotes me: "The brain *develops thought*," and adds, "what are we to understand by this? That the brain thinks?"

Shall I have to tell Mr. B. for the hundredth time, that *man thinks by means of his brain*, just as he sees by means of his eyes, hears by his *ears*? &c., &c. *Man* is the THINKER, and his brain is the *organ*, the *legitimate function* of which is to manifest thought; just as he has organs for the development of every function of his whole organization.

"The brain precedes mind," says Mr. Brewster. Yes; the brain of Adam existed before it developed mind; yea, before he had any life! But when his organization was put in *motion*, his brain manifested thought. *Cerebral motion* is necessary to *thought*. It is even necessary to *dreaming*, as was proved by the case of the girl, to which I have before referred. I can give *expression* to my *mind*. I can spread it out on paper, as I am now

doing; and so can Mr. B.. The idiot has no mind, his *brain* is defective—it is imperfect; he cannot reason; and yet, he has as much *soul* or *spirit* as Mr. B. or myself.

May I not retort, and ask Mr. B. "where" his immortal soul "is?" "Why don't anatomists examine it?" If it be a distinct "*entity*," as he contends, and, also, indestructible, why is it that some physiologist or anatomist has not detected it? And, as he asks me, "Is it something or nothing? Does it exist any where, but in the imagination of the writer,"—Mr. Brewster?

Again: Mr. B., speaking of the "powers" which constitute the mind, says, "Now these powers belong to something, to which we may refer them. What is it?" I answer, *they belong to* MAN, and they are *manifested by the brain*. Mr. B. appears to refer *every thing* to an *immortal soul* and *nothing* to the *man*, as such, at all! What sort of philosophy is this?

Mr. B. says, "Memory is not the mind," "but a capacity of mind." Every intellectual organ has its memory. Thus we have a memory of language, of names, of places, of things, of events, of forms, &c., &c. And the same person's memory may be defective in some things, but excellent in all others. Can Mr. B. explain this on his hypothesis? If memory be an attribute of that which is immortal in man; why is it ever defective? Will Mr. B. tell us? Will he explain how it is that *partial* or *total* idiocy exists? Will he tell us *how* and *why monomania*, or partial derangement, exists, if the mind be not an aggregate of powers? Let him not evade these questions, for I have not evaded his, but let him look them fully in the face.

But Mr. B. informs us that "thought is not mind, but the *action* of mind." This position is untenable, "Thought is" the *result of cerebral "action,"* or the "action" of the brain.

Further on, Mr. B. says: "I find something in man that thinks, reasons, judges." Truly, Mr. B has made a grand discovery! He says, "*I find.*" Where did, or does he find it? In the heart, in the spine, in the lungs, in the *brain*, or diffused all over the body? Will he tell us? I am anxious to know its location—its "habitation," that I may "find" it also. And does he find this "something" in all men? In all idiots? This "something" that "reasons" and "judges;" does he find it equally in the possession of *all;* and if not, what is the reason? Will he not tell us? For my part, "I find" a great many men who cannot "reason," and I rather suspect Mr. B. has seen a few himself! These, of course, have no immortal mind! or, if they have, will Mr. B. explain why it is they cannot "reason?"

Mr. B. is guilty of too much repetition; he repeats and re-repeats the same things over again and again, without advancing a single step. In his article before me, he states my views often enough one would suppose to make them familiar; but he does not refute them. He has too many *ifs* and *suppositions*. But let us have some more of his peculiar logic: "Suppose I was to define matter to be an *aggregate of properties*, should I not be pressed with the question, is there no substance to which these properties belong?"

Yes; and "suppose" I "define" the human mind to be an *aggregate of powers;* and should be "pressed with the question, to what do these powers belong?" I should answer most emphatically, TO MAN.

Mr. B. continues: "And what are powers but the powers of *something?*" True enough; and these "*powers*" are the "powers" of the *man!* Again: "Neither powers nor properties exist abstract from some entity to which they belong." *Good!* And these mental "powers do not exist abstract from" the *man!* One word on the *new birth*. Mr. B. very adroitly attempts to make me occupy what I conceive to be *his* own position on this question. The new birth is not a *physical* but a *moral* change wrought upon an animal, or *physical* man, composed just as I before stated. The spirit of God operates through the Gospel, by motives, arguments, &c., addressed to reason, the moral sentiments, &c., and moves the *whole man to action*, his head, his heart, his ears, his eyes, his tongue, his hands and his feet. He "presents his *body* a living sacrifice to God." The new birth does not change *flesh* to *spirit;* it is a *spiritual* or *moral* change wrought in, and upon, the whole man, who is thus said to be born again.

But let us hear Mr. B. once more: "Mr. W. declares it is *man*, composed of flesh, blood, bones, nerves and brain, who is the subject of the new birth." *Yes I do;* and if Mr. B. will take all these away, *what will be left to be born again?* As to his enquiry about "chemical changes in the blood in regeneration," it is too puerile, too ridiculous to be noted.

What an absurd exposition Mr. B. gives of the Lord's words, "except a *man* be born," &c., when he says it, the mind, is "here called man!" The mind called man! This would make the Lord say, "except a *mind* be born again, it cannot see the kingdom of God." Again, "Except *a mind* be born of water and spirit, it cannot enter into the kingdom of God." A "*mind*" born of *water!* What an idea!! So Mr. B.'s *mind has been born again*, but Mr. B., *himself, has not!*

As it respects Mr. B.'s syllogism about idiots, it presents no difficulty to me at all. God does not hold idiots responsible. But, if they have immortal souls, I see not how Mr. B. will get out of the difficulty. They are difficulties thrown in the way of Mr. B.'s theory, and *he*, not I, must remove them.

Mr. B. has not met the question concerning the beasts. He must try it again. It is not I, but Mr. B. who is "pressed" on this question.

Mr. B. remarks: "The fact that there is a spirit in man, does not, of itself, aside from the will of God, secure immortality. Angels depend upon God, as well as men."

Very well; if "the fact that there is a spirit in man, does not, of itself, secure immortality, why predicate immortality of the *spirit?* Immortality "depends upon the *will* of God," says Mr. Brewster, and so say I; but is it "*the will of God*" that sinners shall be immortal? Will Mr. B. meet me on this question? "Angels depend upon God, as well as men," for their immortality; but are *men* now immortal and "equal to the Angels?" Angels *are* immortal; but men are not, and hence immortality is set before them as something to be sought after. I thank Mr. B. for his admissions! They are fatal to his cause. Again Mr. B. says: "And while nothing indicates that beasts were designed for endless being, every thing teaches this of man." "Nothing indicates that beasts were designed for endless being!" Mr.

Wesley, the celebrated founder of Mr. B.'s Church, thought differently; and if Mr. B. make *intelligence* an attribute of that which is immortal, I see not what other disposition *he* will be able to make of them! But "every thing teaches this of man." "*Every thing!*" If this be so, why has not Mr. B. given at least *one* "*thing*" that "teaches" it? *This he has failed to do.*

Mr. B. speaks of my interpretation of "Fear not them that kill the body," &c., as a "singular" one. But as "singular" as it may be in his estimation, *I am willing to rest the whole controversy upon a full Exegesis of this text.* If he foil me here, then am I forever driven from the field! The terms are easy, will Mr. B. accept of them? We shall see. May the truth shine into the mind of Mr. Brewster, is the desire of

His friend and obedient servant,
J. T. WALSH.

SCRIPTURAL PSYCHOLOGY.*—NO I.

In these essays I shall divide the subject in the following order:

I. MOSAIC PSYCHOLOGY;
II. PROPHETIC PSYCHOLOGY.
III. APOSTOLIC PSYCHOLOGY.

I. MOSAIC PSYCHOLOGY: This phrase embraces a period, extending from the creation of man to the era of Samuel the prophet. To the use of the term soul, during that period, I shall now direct the attention of the reader. But before entering formally into the investigation, I wish to state certain rules or principles of interpretation, which are admitted on all hands to be correct.

RULE 1st. *A word, having a variety of significations, must be defined by the context, to ascertain its specific meaning in any given case.* The correctness and importance of this rule, will be manifest when the term soul is examined.

RULE 2d. *Words are to have their primary meaning, unless there is an obvious necessity for departing from it.*

RULE 3d. *If a given definition be the meaning of a word, in a given place and according to its context, then the definition may be substituted for the word, and it will make sense.*

These rules will be applied in the course of my examination.

I will now proceed: "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath *life*, (in Hebrew *soul*,) and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." This is the *first* use of the term in the Bible. In the common version it is rendered "*life*," but in the original it is *soul*. Let the reader remember that this is not only the *first application* of this word in the Scriptures; but that it was thus used to signify life, by God himself, nearly *six thousand years ago!* Here we have both *high* and *antiquated* authority for asserting that the primary meaning of the term *soul*, is *life*. And, indeed, it cannot imply, or involve, the idea of immortality, for it is here used in reference to "moving" or *creeping* "creatures." Do creeping insects possess immortal souls? If the term soul involves the principle of immortality, then they are immortal, for they have *souls*. Moreover, this term *soul* is applied "to *creeping*" *creatures* before it is to man; yea, and *before* man was created! *Man was not the first living soul!*

Again "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the *living creature*, (in Hebrew, *living soul*,) after his kind, cattle, and the creeping animal, and the beast of the earth after his kind."

Here the earth is made to bring forth "*living souls*" in the form of "cattle," "creeping animal," and "beast of the earth." Here we have a variety of "living souls;" are they all immortal? If so, we shall have immortal "cattle;" immortal "creeping animal;" and immortal "beast." "And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every animal that creepeth upon the earth, in which *is life*, (Hebrew, *a living soul*,) I have given every green herb for food."

In this place "*a living soul*" is ascribed to "*every beast* of the earth," "*every* animal that *creeps*," and to "*every fowl* of the air." Are these "*living souls*" immortal? If so, the earth beneath and the heavens above, are thronged with *immortals!* Are all the beasts immortal, from the great Mastodon to the smallest animalcule that creeps beneath your feet? Are all the fowls immortal, from the Eagle that soars beyond the clouds, and gazes at the sun in his splendor, to the little humming bird that sucks sweetness from a thousand flowers? If you respond in the negative, then, I affirm they are "living souls;" and, therefore, if they are not immortal, it follows that "*living souls*" are not necessarily *immortal souls*. *A living soul* is one thing, and *an* EVER LIVING SOUL is quite another.

In the second chapter of Genesis, seventh verse, we have this account of the creation of man: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, *and man became a living soul.*"

We have now arrived at that, which is usually supposed to distinguish man from the brute creation; but we have already seen, that *man*, as a "*living soul*," has no pre-eminence over the *beasts—they are living souls.* The possession of a "living soul" is not the distinguishing feature between man and the lower animals. The superiority of man must be looked for elsewhere: it does not consist in a superior *soul, nor spirit, or breath*, but in a superior ORGANIZATION, *giving rise to a superior* MIND.

Man was not created immortal, else the tree of life would have been superfluous; but he was made "*a living soul*," or person; not an *immortal living soul*, implying he could never die, nor an *everlasting soul*, implying he should live forever; but simply a living soul, depending on God for the perpetuation of his life—his existence. Eating of the *tree of life* was the means by which he was to live forever. This he would have done, had he not been disobedient; and then God would not suffer him to eat of it, lest he should live forever in sin. His expulsion from the garden of Eden was an act of mercy; and yet men are taught to believe now, that God, who would not suffer our first parents to become immortal sinners, will positively keep sinners alive in a burning hell, suffering indescribable torments, through the endless succession of ages! He must have changed since the *expulsion?*

I shall now examine the places in this book—Genesis—where this word soul occurs, and see what its meaning may be in any given case. Gen.

* These Essays, and those on "Christian Philosophy," &c., the author intends to publish in book form.

xii. 13. And Abram said to his wife: "Say, I pray thee, thou art my sister: that it may be well with me for thy sake; *and my* SOUL *shall live because of thee.*" Now, what is the meaning of this? Did Abram expect to save his "immortal" *soul* by his wife saying she was his sister? Surely not: he only expected to save *his life*, which he thought he was in danger of losing on account of her beauty. The context shows the correctness of this. (See the 11th verse.) "And it came to pass, when he (Abram) had come near to enter into Egypt, that he said to Sarai his wife, Behold now, I know that thou art a fair woman to look upon: Therefore, it will come to pass, when the Egyptians shall see thee, that they will say, This is his wife: *and they will kill me*, but they will save thee alive" Abram apprehended the Egyptians would kill him for his wife; and this was the reason of his request to her, in which he says: *"my soul shall live;"* a Hebraism for *I shall live.*

Turn now to Genesis xix. 20. "Behold now, this city is near to flee to, and it is a small one: Oh, let me escape thither! (Is it not a small one?) *and my soul shall live.*" Can any reasonable person suppose, that Lot expected to save *his* (*immortal*) soul, by fleeing to Zoah? Certainly not. What then did he expect to save? Did he not expect to save his *life?* Surely he did; and his language is equivalent to his having said—"*and I shall live.*" The language of Isaac is worthy of note. He said to Esau: "Make me savory meat, such as I love, and bring it to me, that I may eat; *that my soul may bless thee before I die.*" This according to the Hebrew idiom, means—"THAT I MAY BLESS THEE BEFORE I DIE."

"O my *soul*," says Jacob, "come not thou into their secret;—the secret of Simeon and Levi. Do you suppose that Jacob referred to his "immortal" soul? Or, rather, did he not say, that "*He* did not wish to enter into their secret."

It is said of Shechem—"And his *soul* cleaved to Dinah the daughter of Jacob, and he loved the damsel, and spoke kindly to the damsel."

Now, which shall be believed, the proposition that Shechem had an immortal soul which cleaved to Dinah, or that the whole sentence is but a Hebraism expressive of the fact, that *Shechem himself, cleaved to Dinah in love?* Again, in the eighth verse, Hamor said, "The *soul* of my son Shechem longeth for your daughter." Can any one make me believe that an "immortal" soul *would* "*long*" for a *woman?* It is folly to suppose so. No, the truth is, *Shechem, himself,* '*longed*' *for her*, for a wife; and this is expressed by his "*soul longing.*"

In the thirty-fifth chapter, eighteenth verse, we have this expression: "And it came to pass as *her soul was in departing*, (for she died,)" &c. Perhaps some may be disposed to believe that Rachel had an immortal soul, that departed to heaven. This might have some force, but for the expression explanatory of "her soul departing," "FOR SHE DIED." As it is, this is all the historian meant by her "soul departing." J. T. W.

"BORN OF WATER."

BR. MAGRUDER'S REPLY TO THE EDITOR.

Passing by some points of the Editor's criticism (for the sake of saving time and space) I come to reply to the "difficulty" in which he thinks me involved, that in John, 3d chap., Christ had no allusion to Christian baptism—that because Abraham, Noah, and the thief were justified and pardoned *before* the resurrection of Christ, and therefore *before* Christian baptism was ordained, therefore in John, 3d chap., he was not speaking of Christian baptism. Suppose the Editor be right—that 3d John has no reference to Christian baptism, does it thence follow that because Noah, Job, and the thief were saved without it, we (in this day) may be saved also, independently of this ordinance? Certainly not; for it is answered *conclusively*, no such command was given to *them*, and "where no law is, there is no transgression, for sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John, 3d chap. 4. Now such a law *is* given to *our* contemporaries, and on that account they must obey it at their peril. And here is the very point of the argument. The argument is *not* that 3d John 5, relates to baptism, (though I am persuaded it does,) but that because the thief, Abraham, &c., are to be saved *without* baptism, we are not *thence* to conclude that we, who live under different laws are also to be saved without it. It is to this point I call the Editor to respond.

It seems to me (in all kindness) it is no answer to this reasoning, to urge that as Christ said, "except *a* man (that is *any* man) be born of water and the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God," and then to cite the *fact* that Abraham, &c. have *never* been born of water, and will be in the kingdom, and *so infer* that baptism is *not* essential to entrance into the kingdom. This is certainly not "rightly to divide the word of truth." The declaration, "except a man be born of water," &c., relates obviously to the future, and may be the present, but certainly not *the past.* What would be thought of a law-giver who, when propounding a *new* law, should hold it applicable to acts committed or omitted *before* it was enacted, thus giving it an *ex post facto* effect? The law, "except a man be born of water and the spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God," of course, and obviously means, "he cannot *in future;*" *hereafter* no man can enter except on these terms. To illustrate: Moses enacted circumcision, and declared that *whoever* neglected it, should "be cut off from the congregation of the Lord." Would you therefore contend that no one can be saved unless he be circumcised? Certainly not: the reason is plain. Because no such law is obligatory under the Christian dispensation. In regard to the thief, the case is plain. Christ had the power, when on earth, and often exercised it, to forgive sins unconditionally. He could say to the sick of the palsy, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee," annexing no condition, because, as he said of himself, "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." So to the thief, he graciously said, "Thou shall be with me in Paradise." But how stands the matter *now?* He is no longer here *in person* to forgive sins. He proceeds now by *laws*, made known in the gospel, "for the *obedience* of faith among all nations," and to these laws, ordinances, and institutions, must we submit ourselves (*as did Saul, of Tarsus. Acts* 22: 14—16,) in order "to wash away our sins," and to obtain the blessings promised. Well may Paul himself say, "How shall we *escape*, if we NEGLECT so *great* salvation, which *at the first began* to be *spoken by the Lord*, and was confirmed (or fully explained and elucidated) by them that heard him."

I submit the above as some reply to the objec-

tion that because Abram, the thief, &c., were saved without Christian baptism, therefore we *may* "escape," though we "neglect" it.

But the Editor urges this question, "*Is being born of water*, John 3: 5, Christian baptism." He replies, "with present light" "*it is not.*" If *not* then, pray *what* is it? If not *baptism*, what is it, I repeat? Those who object, are bound in candor to give us a *better* explanation of the words than we offer. What is a *birth of water* if not *baptism?* What a birth of water and spirit, if *not Christian* baptism? I await the reply. Meanwhile, let me say, I have never said (I believe) that 3d John 5, had exclusive reference to *Christian* baptism, implying in the subject a belief in the death and resurrection of Christ. *John's* baptism was no doubt as essential to those to whom John preached as was the baptism of the day of Pentecost to those to whom Peter preached. *Both* were "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." They differed in the *facts* to be previously believed. Paul says this in Acts 19, "John verily preached to the people that they should believe on him who was to come after him, that is Christ Jesus." Hearing this, they (John's disciples) were baptized in the name of the Lord. For a Jew to reject John's proclamation and baptism, was no doubt as great a sin as for Jew or Gentile to reject the apostle's. Nicodemus was one of these rejectors of John's baptism. Jesus, "who knew what was in man," discerning his incredulity on this point, said to him at once, "Except a man be born of water and spirit (as John's disciples were) he cannot enter," &c. Until this law is repealed, or unless any one in this generation can shew that *he* is embraced in the *exception* which saves the thief, the palsied man and others to *whom the Saviour spake audibly when on earth*, let every unbaptized man or woman who hopes for a place and a name in that kingdom, beware of neglecting a compliance with these terms of admission. Such may be among the foolish virgins who go to replenish their lamps at the moment of the Lord's approach, and so are shut out from his presence, for *some*, we are assured, will experience this bitter fate.

A. B. MAGRUDER.

NOTES ON BR. MAGRUDER'S REPLY.

We do not look upon John 3: 5, in the light of "*law*" at all; it is the announcement of *a fact*; which fact was just *as real and important* in the days of Noah, Abraham, Job and Daniel, as in the days of Nicodemus. But if it were a "*law*" it was in "force" from its announcement, unless the Law Maker specified another time, future, for it to take effect. No such specification is appended, hence Br. M.'s difficulty remains. The dispute between Br. M. and ourself is not whether it is *essential* to salvation to attend to Christian Baptism—that topic we leave to him and Br. Grew. The entire argument between Br. M. and ourself is, "*Is being born of water*, John 3: 5, *Christian baptism?*" Br. M. must not try to draw us away from that point. He admitted, in his previous article, that "Christian Baptism was not instituted until *after* our Lord hung upon the cross;" that admission sustained our position that being born of water, John 3: 5, was not Christian Baptism. Br. M. now changes the issue, and calls us to respond to a point in which he and Br. Grew are at issue; and we must be excused from interfering between them. Br. M. entirely misapprehends us in saying, that we "cite the *fact* that Abraham, &c., have *never* been born of water and will be in the kingdom, and so *infer* that baptism is not essential," &c. Really, Br. M., we did *no such thing*. We did not say that "Abraham, &c., have never been born of water." We asked if Br. M. would undertake to prove they would enter the kingdom without being "*born again?*" we know they will be in the kingdom, and we believe they will, at the time, have been born again, in *precisely* the sense in which our Saviour used that expression, John 3: 5. "The declaration," John 3: 5, "relates obviously" to the "*past*" as really as to the "*future*," if it relates to any thing done this side the resurrection. Our Lord states a *fact*, not makes a "law;" and that *fact* was as really *a fact* in the days of Abraham as in the days of Nicodemus; and none the less so because Nicodemus, "a master of Israel" was ignorant of it. Our Saviour himself virtually affirms this truth, verse 10—after Nicodemus expressed his surprise—"Art thou a master of Israel and *knowest not these things?*" Poor Nicodemus was blamed, according to Br. M., and those that think with him, for *not knowing* what was impossible to have been known, because according to them the thing to be known had *no existence till now*. Really, our Lord was too severe on Nicodemus, "if these things are so." Why censure him for not knowing that a man must be born of water and the spirit, if the *fact* had no existence in the Scriptures till that hour? and had never in any clear form been stated before? Tell us, ye "masters of Israel," why our Lord blames Nicodemus for his ignorance of a thing that could not have been known, because it had no being before, if your position is the true one?

We repeat, again, that *we* have made *no such* statement as Br. M. attributes to us, that "because Abraham, &c., were saved without Christian *baptism*, therefore we *may*," &c. When *we* make such a statement it will be time enough for us to defend it. Br. M. says, "If being born of water, John 3: 5, is not baptism, what is it?" and he adds, "I repeat—those who object are bound in candor to give us a better explanation of the words than we offer," &c. Br. M. further adds,—"I wait the reply." Now, he need not *wait; we* gave our *opinion* in the Examiner, No. 8. Dr. N. Smith gave his in No. 9; and if Br. M. will allow us our judgment in this matter, we will say, that either of these opinions are "*better*" than the one for which he contends; for that, with present light, to us, is the most unlikely and improbable of either.

Br. M.'s *assumption* that "Nicodemus was one of those who rejected John's baptism" shall have an answer when he gives us the proof; at present the evidence is the other way. His *assumption*, also, that "John's disciples were born of water *and spirit*" shall have like attention when he gives us the evidence; as he has offered *no proof* of either, we need not go into the argument, but meet both with a simple denial.

We have much hope of our good brother M.; for he shows, like ourself, that he is not ashamed to change when he finds his ground not tenable. He found that being born of water, John 3: 5, could not be applied to *Christian* baptism, so now he has fallen back on *John's*. We think we shall be agreed yet; at any rate, we will not quarrel if we are not agreed.

'THE SECOND DEATH.'

By Richard Whately, D. D., Arbhbishop of Dublin.

'Many of the ancient Fathers look upon (the expulsion of Adam from Eden) as a *merciful dispensation*, THAT MAN MIGHT NOT BE PERPETUATED IN A STATE OF SIN.' Bishop Patrick.

'Whatsoever had a beginning can also have an ending, and it *shall* die, *unless it be daily watered from the streams flowing from the fountain of life, and refreshed with the dew of heaven, and the wells of God*: and therefore God had prepared a tree in Paradise to have supported Adam in his *artificial immortality*: immortality was not in his *nature*, but in the hands and arts, in the favor and super-additions of God.' Bishop Jeremy Taylor.

We know that in this present world there *is* evil as well as good. whether in the next world there will be an end put to all evil, is a question on which Scripture, if we look to that alone, gives us *only this slight hint;* that we are told (by Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 25) that Christ 'must reign till He have put all things under his feet;' and that 'the last enemy that shall be *destroyed* is death.' And this does not seem consistent with the continuance forever of a number of wicked beings, alive, and hating Christ, and odious in his sight.

The Scripture do not, I think, afford us any grounds for expecting that those who shall be condemned at the last day as having wilfully rejected or rebelled against their Lord, will be finally delivered; that their doom, and that of the evil Angels, will ever be *reversed*.

What that doom will be—whether the terms in which its commonly spoken of in Scripture ('*death*,' '*destruction*,' '*perishing*,' etc.*) are to be understood figuratively, as denoting immortal life in a state of misery, or, *more literally*, as denoting *a final* extinction of existence—this is quite a different question. It is certain that the words 'life,' 'eternal life,' 'immortality,' etc., are always applied to the condition of those, and of *those only*, who shall at the last day be approved as 'good and faithful servants,' who are to 'enter into the joy of their Lord.'

'*Life*' as applied to their condition, is usually understood to mean 'happy life.' And that theirs will *be* a happy life, we are indeed plainly taught; *but I do not think we are anywhere taught that the word* 'life' *does of itself necessarily imply happiness*. If so, indeed, it would be a mere *tautology* to speak of a 'happy life;' and a *contradiction* to speak of a 'miserable life;' which we know is not the case, according to the usage of any language. In all Ages and Countries, 'life,' and the words answering to it in other languages, have always been applied, in ordinary discourse to a wretched life, *no less properly* than to a happy one. Life, therefore, in the received sense of the word, *would apply* equally to the condition of the blest and the condemned, supposing these last to be destined to continue forever living in a state of misery. And yet, to *their* condition the words 'life' and 'immortality' *never are applied in Scripture*. If therefore we suppose the *hearers* of Jesus and his Apostles to have understood, as nearly as possible in the ordinary sense, the words employed, *they must naturally have conceived* them to mean (if they were taught nothing to the contrary) that the condemned were really and literally to be '*destroyed*,' and cease to exist; not that they were to exist forever in a state of wretchedness. For they are never spoken of as being *kept alive*, but as *forfeiting* life: as for instance, 'Ye will not come unto me that ye may *have life*:'—'He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath *not* life.' And again, '*perdition*,' '*death*,' '*destruction*,' are employed in numerous passages to express the doom of the condemned. All which expressions would, as I have said, be naturally taken in their usual and obvious sense, if nothing were taught to the contrary.

That these expressions however are to be understood not in their ordinary sense, but figuratively, to signify an immortality of suffering, *is inferred*, by a large proportion of Christians from some other passages: as where our Lord speaks of 'everlasting punishment,' 'everlasting fire,' and of being 'cast into Hell, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.'†

From such passages as these it has been inferred that the sufferings, and consequently the life, of the condemned is never to end. And the expression would certainly bear that sense; *if* these were the only ones on the subject that are to be found, in Scripture. *But they will also bear another sense;* which if not more probable in itself, is *certainly more reconcilable with the ordinary meaning of the words* '*destruction*,' etc. which so often occur. The expressions of 'eternal punishment,' 'unquenchable fire,' etc. *may mean* merely that there is to be *no deliverance*—no revival—no restoration of the condemned. 'Death' simply *does not shut out the hope of being brought to life again*: 'eternal death' does. 'Fire' may be *quenched* before it has entirely consumed what it is burning: 'unquenchable fire' would seem most naturally to mean that which destroys it utterly.

It may be said, indeed, that *supposing* Man's soul to be an immaterial Being, it cannot be consumed and destroyed by literal *material* fire or worms. That is true: *but no more can it* suffer *from these*. We all know that no fire, literally so called, can give us any pain unless it reach our bodies. The 'fire,' therefore, and the 'worm that are spoken of, must at any rate, it would seem, be something figuratively so-called—*something that is to the soul what worms and fire are to a body*. And as the effects of worms or fire is, not to *preserve* the body that they prey upon, but to *consume, destroy, and put an end to it, it would follow*, if the correspondence hold good, *that the fire, figuratively so called*, which is prepared for the condemned, *is something that is really to destroy and put an end to them;* and is called 'everlasting,' or 'unquenchable' fire, to denote that they are not to be saved from it, but that their destruction is to be *final*. So in the parable of the tares, our Lord

* See Matt. x. 28; Rom. vi. 21—23, etc.

† This last expression of his is taken from the book of the prophet Isaiah (lxvi. 24), who speaks of 'the *carcases* of the *men* that have transgressed, whose worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto *all* [living] *flesh*:' describing evidently *the kind of doom inflicted by the Eastern nations on the vilest offenders*, who were not only slain, but their bodies deprived of the rights of burial, and either *burned to ashes* (which, among them was regarded as a great indignity), *or left* to moulder above ground and *be devoured by worms*.

describes himself as saying, 'gather ye first the tares, and bind them in bundles to *burn them;* but gather the wheat *into my garner;*' as if to denote that the one is to be (as we know is the practice of the husbandman) carefully PRESERVED, and the other completely PUT AN END TO.

We must not, indeed, venture to conclude at once, from our conviction of the divine goodness and power, that evil will ever cease to exist since we know not how to explain the existence of any evil at all. We can only say that there is some *unknown* (reason) for it; and that it is a foolish presumption to think of assigning a limit to the effects of the unknown cause, except where revelation guides us. But when we are told that Christ is to 'reign till he shall have put all things under his feet,' and that 'the last enemy that shall be destroyed is DEATH;' this *does* afford some ground for expecting *the ultimate extinction of evil* and of suffering, by the *total destruction* of such as are *incapable* of good and of happiness. If 'eternal death' means *final* death—death without any revival—we can understand what is meant by 'Death being the last enemy *destroyed*,' viz.: that none henceforth are to be subjected to it. But if 'Death' be understood to mean everlasting life in misery, *then, it would appear that Death is never to be destroyed at all;* since, altho no one should be henceforth *sentenced* to it, it would still be going on as a continual *infliction*, for ever.

On the whole, therefore, I think we are not warranted in concluding (as some have done,) *so positively* concerning this question as to make it a point of Christian faith to interpret figuratively, and not literally, the '*death*' and '*destruction*' spoken of in Scripture as the doom of the condemned; and to insist on the belief that they are to be *kept alive* for ever.

There are persons, I believe, who do not like to hear this question spoken of as one that is left *undecided* by Scripture. Some would wish that the final extinction of the condemned should be positively declared, because they *wish* to believe that doctrine *true;* and some again, from thinking it a *dangerous* doctrine, wish to have the opposite one positively declared. *But all such wishes are quite foreign from the subject.* In judging of the sense of Scripture, we should be careful to guard against the error of suffering our wishes to bias the mind. If, indeed, we had to devise a religion for ourselves, we might indulge our wishes as to what is desirable, or our conjectures as to what seems to us in itself probable, or our judgment as to what may seem advisable. But when we have before us 'Scripture-revelations' on any subject, it is for us to endeavor to make out what it *is* that Scripture teaches, and what it does *not* teach. We may wonder perhaps why Scripture has taught us so and so, or why it has withheld such and such knowledge, or why it has not more distinctively revealed this or that: but if we presume to interpret Scripture according to our inclinations or judgments, or *to speak positively on points which Scripture has left doubtful*, because *we* think it advisable that all such doubts should be removed, it is plain that this is, not to make *Scripture our guide*, but to make *ourselves the guide of Scripture.*

On one point, and that which ought to afford us the fullest satisfaction, we are left in no doubt. That 'when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, we also (if of the number of his approved servants) shall appear with him in glory,' which is to last for ever, we have the fullest assurance from Scripture.

Ignorant, however, as the wisest must be on these subjects, the most ignorant of us is wise enough for his own purpose, if he will but seek for the knowledge of his duty, and use what knowledge he has. Short-sighted as we are, we can see by the light of God's word that there are two paths set before us; the ends of which we cannot indeed *distinctly* see; but we know that the one leads to everlasting happiness, and the other to ruin; and that God has offered us our choice between them, and entreated us to take the better, and promised us strength to walk in it, if we will 'strive to enter in at the straight gate.'

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, NOV., 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Bible.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—The next number will complete the present volume. No person will have it sent to them after that, unless we receive payment *in advance*—see *terms* first page. This rule will apply to all who are now subscribers, as well as to new ones. We hope our present patrons will attend to this in season, and avail themselves of some one of the "*Three Offers*" in our last number. Immediately on the issue of our next number, we shall have a quantity of Vol. III bound. The price of it will be *seventy-five* cents, single copy, or four copies for $2, current money, sent us free of expense. Those who wish the present Vol. complete, unbound, can be supplied with it at the subscription prices. If they wish us to lay aside any for them, bound or unbound, till they call for them, we will do so if they send us the money with the order. Remember, if you wish the present volume complete, you must apply for it soon.

THE "THREE OFFERS."—In our offer of the "Six Sermons," 18mo., we *include* our views on the Intermediate State of the Dead, and the tract, "Rich man and Lazarus," with each copy of the Sermons. The postage on each copy, including the whole, is about *four* cents. We state this for the information of all inquirers. Our "offers" cannot be extended to friends in Canada, without the addition of the amount of postage we are obliged to *prepay* on the Examiners sent there, which is eighteen cents, on each copy, per year; and also the postage we will have to pay on the Sermons, if sent by mail. The best Canada bank bills are *five* per cent discount here.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—We wish to oblige all, but we cannot posibly publish every thing we would if we had a weekly issue, or an enlarged monthly. Our friends, then, must bear with us if their com-

munications do not always appear. We may also err in judgment in our selections from their favors; but we will do the best we can. We have given place to more commendatory items during the year than we intended at the outset, but it has been done by the desire of others, contrary to our own judgment in some respects.

We are compelled to lay over several articles intended for the present number; and among them the first article of a Review of the Lectures of J. W. Bonham, against the destruction of the wicked, in which that production of endless miseryism is handled as it merits, but kindly, by H. Grew.

"PROPHECY OF ZECHERIAH."—The Bible Advocate, published at Hartford, Conn., seems almost to take fire at our remarks upon this prophecy in the last Examiner. It is "half inclined to believe" our article was "designed as a refutation" of one it had published; but the Advocate says:—"Our arrangement and proof are such as are not touched by this reply." We wonder why it "flutters" if it was "*not touched?*" Why be at the pains of publishing six columns of additional matter to help that which was not harmed?

But, says the Advocate,—"If the Examiner had only published our article, we should have no need to say a word in reply." Did not all those persons see your "*article*," Br. Advocate, that will see your *reply?* If so, your "reply" is a "*needless*" affair according to your own admission. Did not the Advocate then undertake a work of *supererogation* in replying at all? Did that paper really think the Examiner would copy its "article?" We must have been excessively fond of *accommodation*, to have copied six columns and a half from a weekly paper. When did that paper ever set us the example of such disinterestedness? Carefully, it would seem, till now, have the *Editors* abstained from ever mentioning our paper, though we have published occasionally for more than three years, and regularly for more than a year. They have not copied an article from the Examiner, nor mentioned its name all this long while, except at the time when Dr. Crary has managed the editorial. With that exception, the Advocate never let its readers know that such a paper as the Examiner was in existence. Now it seems to wonder that we could not have copied its long article on Zecheriah! "Consistency should blush for an answer," truly! If the Advocate intends the introduction of its last article, of an "old fiddle" and "Judas" hanging "himself," to illustrate our reasoning, as it evidently does, we will only say—"Physician, heal thyself:" we have no controversy with such *very logical* deductions.

The "article" in our "exchange" paper, to which we referred in our last, in one and the same paragraph, admits the Mount of Olives, Zech. 14, is literal, and says "the feet of the Lord stood upon" it at his first advent; and then, when it comes to the cleaving of the Mount of Olives, and half of it removing one way and half the other, it means "the destruction of the Jewish polity"!! Aye, and the "fleeing to the valley of the mountains" is "literally to be dispersed among the Gentiles"!!! If this is not an "arbitrary application of scripture," we may defy a Jesuit to tell what is. But, we leave that paper to pursue its own way, and we shall take the course to which we believe God and duty calls us. We feel no fears in letting our remarks on Zecheriah go the world over, without strengthening them, along with the *twelve and a half* columns our exchange paper has served up for its readers.

MORTAL AND IMMORTAL TOGETHER.—"No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you," Job 12: 2. One of our exchange papers, in laboring to prove us wrong in the opinion that some will be probationers in the next age, or under Messiah's personal reign, and to avoid the difficulty in which it was placed by our argument, from the fact that angels have visited and preached to men; as, for example, Gabriel to Daniel—to the father of John the Baptist—to Mary, the mother of Jesus—and others—gravely inquires—"Are angels immortal?" and adds—"The same argument which proves that they are, will prove that men are." Surely, "wisdom shall die with you," brother Exchange. Our Lord saith—"They that are accounted worthy to obtain *that age*, AND the resurrection from the dead, *cannot die any more:* [why not?] FOR they are *equal* unto the angels:" *that* is the reason why they cannot die any more. Here our Lord clearly affirms that the holy angels cannot die: but our Exchange, says—"They are not said to be immortal:" and it further affirms that "Angels and men will be all of an age in immortality." Our Lord is thus represented as saying—"They that obtain that age," &c., "cannot die any more, for they are equal to *themselves*." Truly—"How forcible are right words." Will our Exchange give us chapter and verse in proof that "angels and men will be all of an age in immortality"? aye, and a little proof that angels will ever be made immortal at all, if they are not so *before* men? or, if those are not immortal now who "kept their first estate"?

We conceive our brother Exchange has made another very great mistake in applying Paul's language, 1 Timothy 6: 15—16, "to Christ;" a mistake, however, which would be pardonable in a learner, but hardly so in one who is so *positive* in conclusions, without evidence, as some of his statements are. His words are—"Paul, referring

to Christ, the only Potentate, says, *Who only* hath immortality, dwelling in light, &c." If our brother had quoted the remainder of the verse, he would have found it to read thus—"Which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen nor can see." Will he affirm that is "Christ?" The same apostle, in the same epistle, chapter 1: 17, affirms that "The King eternal, immortal, *invisible*," is "THE ONLY WISE GOD." He *only* hath *inherent* immortality: but, does it therefore follow that holy angels are not immortal, because men are not yet so? Is that logical? Just as much so as the following:—"There is *none good* but *one*, that is God," —"*therefore* no man nor angel is good." Though God alone is *inherently* good, yet he, at *diverse times*, imparts of that goodness to his creatures. How then can our brother Exchange prove that God does not impart immortality at diverse times to his creatures? And hence, how can he prove what he has so *positively* affirmed, that angels are not now immortal? If his assertion is to be relied upon as proof, it proves too much—it proves angels never can be immortal; for, then the "only Potentate" could not be said "*only*" to have "immortality."

Our brother seems to say, that our Lord was mortal after his resurrection, and until his ascension, for he says—"Nor is there any evidence that he was immortalized, until he was glorified after his ascension." Pray, why did our brother not affirm at once, that he is not "immortalized" yet? for he says—"Angels and men will be all of one age in immortality." "The *man* Christ Jesus," [1 Tim. 2: 5,] is not "immortalized" yet, according to these *assumptions*. We agree with our brother, *fully*, that "Faith founded in *speculation*, may supplant Christian faith, but it can never honor the Gospel."

WE have received, we presume from the author, a small pamphlet of fifty-eight pages, on "The purpose of God in creating the World," &c. "By E. R. Pinney." We have not examined it as fully as we may. In some things we agree with him, and in others we are compelled to disagree; particularly in the application of the *prophetic periods*. But time will soon show if he is right. Those who may wish to procure the work, can obtain it of the author, at Seneca Falls, N. Y. Price $4 per hundred; six cents single copy.

THE PENALTY OF ADAM'S SIN.

A writer singing himself "Timothy," in the Bible *Advocate*, September 28th, very briefly notices our article on the "Death Threatened to Adam, not Moral, nor Spiritual, but Literal," in the Examiner of July. Instead, however, of letting the "*original sin*" of that article fall back on the Bible Examiner, "Timothy" says it is "A piece [that] appeared in the Advent Harbinger of July 15th." That is true, but, it is not *all the truth*. The Harbinger gave credit for it to the "*Bible Examiner*." However, we care nothing about that so far as *we* are concerned: if "Timothy" is afraid to say *Bible Examiner*, or does not choose to name it, we have no fault to find on that account.

"Timothy" does not quote us correct, or the Advocate has made him say what he did not mean. He represents us as saying that "It involves the greatest absurdity, and that it confounds language, to suppose that moral death was *included* in the sentence threatened to Adam."

Our language is, "Some contend *that* death [threatened to Adam] was a moral death. Such a view involves the greatest absurdity and confounds language. We shall see this by an examination of those texts in Moses and the Prophets where the phrase *surely die* occurs." We did go into that examination, and found, yea demonstrated, that that phrase is never used where *moral death* is the subject referred to; and this "Timothy" does not attempt to disprove from Moses and the Prophets; evidently, because it cannot be done. We said not a word about whether "moral death was *included* in the sentence;" but we did say, *that* was not THE *penalty* of Adam's sin, which God threatened; and we repeat it—to maintain that it was, "involves the greatest absurdity, and confounds language:" it is contrary to the entire analogy of the language of the Law and the Prophets, as we have shown; and it will be time enough to strengthen that position when "Timothy" gives any evidence that we have misunderstood or misapplied the words of Moses and the Prophets.

The civil law threatens men with *death* who commit murder—that they "shall be hung by the neck till they are dead." Is that a literal death, or a *political* one? Perhaps "Timothy" would say it "*includes*" political "death." Suppose we admit that—Is *political* death THE *penalty*? or, is it a mere accident? an unavoidable consequence, which it would be "*absurd*" to legislate about? It follows as a matter of course when a man has committed murder, that he loses his political life; but no one ever dreamed that was the penalty for murder. Equally absurd is it, to maintain that when God said to man, whom he had just "formed of the dust of the ground," "thou shalt surely die," he meant a *moral* death! That would amount to just this—"O, Adam, I have formed thee of the dust of the ground—*if thou sinnest, thou shalt surely* BE A SINNER!!!" Most marvellous penalty! Know, O man, if thou dost commit murder thou shalt surely be a murderer!

"Timothy" next goes on to catechise us; and we judge he has been to the "Assembly's Catechism" to get his questions—they are a very fair specimen of that school.

QUESTION 1. "Does mankind retain the moral image that Adam had when he was first created?"

ANSWER. When you tell us what moral image Adam had at that time we will answer you.

QUESTION 2. "If man has not lost his moral image, is not morally dead, why should Christ have come to atone for sin?"

ANSWER. The expressions "moral image"—"morally dead"—and "spiritual death," are all very good *mythology*, but do not belong to Bible theology—they are as unscriptural as "*immortal souls*;" and belong to the same *brotherhood*. It is by such stereotyped phrases, brought out of the Creeds of Babylon, that men's minds are bewilder-

ed and blinded. The q
upon words. If you had a
a sinner—was not subjecte
should have come as a del
been plain; but such
brought you exactly on
But we reply to your que
Adam's sin was moral
been no atonement; and t
That death which could r
of *like* character—Christ r
death"—must be "mora
be to "atone for sin"
have long seen that the
"Timothy" contends for,
atonement, and establish
"endless misery" of all
do anything. "The se
first: if the first is a *mor*
if the first is *literal* so is
avoiding this conclusion.
first death is a moral de
"second death" who
morally alive: hence, eit
alive and then die a sec
none can possibly die th
only be to continue und
But still another absurdit
theory, *viz*: If the first d
they must be made mo
moral death, then, this
in the present life; i. e
dead to be liable to mo
another moral death afte
of necessity, be the THI
moral death of Adam the
if he can.

QUESTION 3. "Where i
ment? If literal death w
to the first trangression, if
tained in the sentence aga
demands, only to bring thi

ANSWER. Can "Tim
show that "justice has'
"the first transgression
do it. We deny that j
mand than that. The
sion is inflicted—there i
all are made subject t
Adam, Jesus Christ, h
"*abolish death*;" this he
all that are in their gra
living which is equivale
"Timothy" *seems* to th
in the first sin; for, acc
man [all men] did not
there is no need of a
otherwise, but shall not

"Timothy" says—"Th
18, &c., says, Can it mea
[*asks*] Are not the wicke
would say, [*ask*] does not
his argument by allowing
dead?"

We would *say* in re
question, "Are not the
dead?" we used the ph
quotation, though we d
was using our opponent'
the inconsistency of ap
what they call moral
man is morally dead, is

ed and blinded. The question is a mere play upon words. If you had asked "If Adam was not a sinner—was not subjected to death—why Christ should have come as a deliverer?" all would have been plain; but such a question would have brought you exactly on the ground we occupy. But we reply to your question—If THE *penalty* of Adam's sin was moral death there could have been no atonement; and the race of man was lost. That death which could make atonement must be of *like* character—Christ must have died a "moral death"—must be "morally dead." That would be to "atone for sin" with a vengeance. We have long seen that the advocates of the theory "Timothy" contends for, are virtually denying the atonement, and establishing the doctrine of the "endless misery" of all mankind, so far as they do anything. "The second death" is *like* the first: if the first is a *moral* death so is the second: if the first is *literal* so is the second: there is no avoiding this conclusion. Nor is that all: if the first death is a moral death, no man can die the "second death" who has not been first made morally alive: hence, either all men are thus made alive and then die a second moral death, or else none can possibly die the second death—it would only be to continue under the first moral death. But still another absurdity follows the moral death theory, *viz:* If the first death be a moral death, as they must be made morally alive to die a second moral death, then, this "second death" must be in the present life; i. e., they must be morally dead to be liable to moral death! and if they die another moral death after the resurrection, it must, of necessity, be the THIRD moral death!! Let the moral death of Adam theorist escape this dilemma if he can.

QUESTION 3: "Where is the necessity of the atonement? If literal death was the only penalty attached to the first trangression, if literal death only was contained in the sentence against sin, then justice has no demands, only to bring this dust back to dust again."

ANSWER. Can "Timothy," or any one else, show that "justice has" any other "demand" for "the first transgression?" If they can, let them do it. We deny that justice has any further demand than that. The penalty of that transgression is inflicted—there is no remitting the penalty, all are made subject to death: but the second Adam, Jesus Christ, has obtained the right to "*abolish death;*" this he will do by a resurrection of all that are in their graves, or by a change of the living which is equivalent to a resurrection. But, "Timothy" *seems* to think all sin is wrapped up in the first sin; for, according to his argument, if man [all men] did not morally die by Adam's sin there is no need of an atonement. We think otherwise, but shall not argue that point now.

"Timothy" says—"The brother in quoting Ezk. 3: 18, &c., says, Can it mean moral death? and also says [*asks*] Are not the wicked already morally dead? I would say, [*ask*] does not the brother here overthrow his argument by allowing that the wicked are morally dead?"

We would *say* in reply, when we asked the question, "Are *not* the wicked already morally dead?" we used the phrase "morally dead" as a *quotation*, though we did not mark it as such; it was using our opponent's own phraseology to show the inconsistency of applying the threatening to what they call moral death. To say a wicked man is morally dead, is to say, a wicked man *is* wicked. But God said "to the wicked, thou shalt surely die," &c., in Ezk. 3: 18. The threatening did not relate to what "Timothy" calls a "moral death;" for, the person spoken of was, at the time addressed, what *he* calls "*morally* dead." We did not, therefore, "overthrow" our "argument," but established it. But if we were to admit that all wicked men are "morally dead" it does not touch the question, as to what death was the penalty of the law Adam violated.

"Timothy" adds—"I know that the state of mankind by nature and by practice, would teach that doctrine." [That is, that "the wicked are morally dead."]

The wicked most certainly *are wicked*—"morally dead," if you please—who disputes that? The question is not touched even if you had proved that. What has that to do with the penalty of the first transgression? Just as much as the fact that a man is *politically* dead when he has committed murder, and no more. His being politically dead does not prove *that* was the penalty of the law against murder. "Timothy" quotes Scripture—"To be carnally minded is death,"—"And you being dead in your sins," &c., [Not *Adam's* sins, but *their own.—Ed. Ex.*]—"Having the understanding darkened; being alienated from the life of God." The inference of "Timothy" from these texts is truly marvellous; he says:—

"We see that scripture agrees with what the brother allows, that the wicked are morally dead, and that they have been ever since the fall of man."

We have made no such admission as this language *seems* to imply. We do not allow that any man since Adam, or *by* Adam, was made "morally dead." Adam sinned, and hence was a sinner; but God has sworn by himself that no man should have occasion to say, "the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge;" Ezk. 18: 1—4. We wonder when men will cease to impeach the oath of the Lord of Hosts; and leave off the guilt of charging on God their own wickedness.

"But," says Timothy, "See the pride, the anger, the hatred, the malice, that rushed into the human heart after the fall." He adds, "Cain was morally dead—Lamech was morally dead."—&c.

Prejudice and superstition are always blind. Some men can see nothing good in the world: we do not know but such men are "morally," or, at least, *mentally* dead. Was Abel morally dead? We wonder if Cain did not "morally" kill him! Quite as likely as that Cain was "morally dead" by any act but his own; or, that his "moral death" was "*the penalty* of the first transgression" of his "father!" Was Seth morally dead? Was Enoch morally dead? Was Methuselah? Was Noah? Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob? Was Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Caleb, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and the Three Hebrews? Were all these "morally dead? Oh, but these were not "the wicked," it is only "the wicked" that "Timothy" says are "morally dead!!" That is, it is only the wicked that are wicked! But "pride, anger," &c., "rushed into the human heart, after the fall." Did not a little *rush* into mother Eve's before she fell? Was not the desire to "be as Gods" a little touch of "Timothy's" "pride rushing into the human heart" *before* "the fall!" Wonder if Eve was not born of somebody that was "morally dead!" Really, one needs to take a lesson of Job to know how to deal with those who can set aside the plainest declarations of Moses and the Pro-

phets on the subject of the death penalty to Adam. Let "Timothy," or any one else, take the article which drew out his remarks, and refute the position there laid down, if he can. We challenge them to do it. Our columns shall be open for them to make the attempt. The question is simply this, *Do Moses or the Prophets give any other interpretation of the phrase* "SURELY DIE" *than that of a* LITERAL *death?* We affirm, *they do not.* Who will join issue with us on that point?

P. S. Since writing the foregoing we have obtained and read the "Three Lectures of J. W. Bonham," delivered in England, on "The Eternal Punishment of the Wicked not Annihilation." We had seen the Boston organ of endless misery's notice of this work, which led us to desire to see the *puffed* "Lectures." They are, in our mind, a most singular failure—quite a good *echo* from Boston, Massachusetts; and a pity if Boston could not praise its own child. At another time we may give our readers a specimen of the double-faced character of that *abortion.* We just remark now that the author says, page 22, "The *nature* of the death Adam died in consequence of sinning is the point at issue." As our remarks on that subject have already been presented in the Examiner of July and this month, we shall add no more now, but may say more hereafter. We have no fear for the result, if the "Three Lectures of J. W. Bonham" are the best our opponents can do. We say to them all as Micaiah said to Ahab, king of Israel, 2 Chron. 18: 14, "Go ye up and prosper!!" Please read that chapter if you wish to know the result.

THE DEAD UNCONSCIOUS;

OR, OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—No. II.

It is said: "That the souls of the righteous are preserved in life in the intermediate state is positively stated by Matthew, Mark, and Luke." Where have either of them "*positively* stated" such a doctrine? We cannot find it. But "Moses was seen by Peter, James, and John, conversing with our Saviour upon the mount of transfiguration." Let it be distinctly understood, that manifestation was a "*vision;*" so our Lord himself declares, Matt. 17: 9. It appears, from Luke 9, at the time "Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep;" but "when they were awake, they saw his glory and the two men that stood with him." But it seems they were not so much awake as to know distinctly what was passing; for Peter wanted to make "tabernacles"—"*not knowing what he said.*" Now as this was a representation by a "vision," it does not follow that Moses was personally and *really* present on that occasion, any more than it follows that the saints were *really* in life at the time Daniel saw the little horn making war upon them and prevailing against them, even till the judgment set; or, that the new heavens and new earth were actually in being when John saw them eighteen hundred years ago; or that the things seen in any other "vision" were realities at the time seen. This "vision" was designed to represent our Lord, himself, as he *will be* when he comes in his kingdom—not as he then really was: for, as yet, *he* had not been "*quickened by the spirit;*" and before that event would take place he was to be "*put to death in the flesh.*" He was not, therefore, *actually* in his glory at the transfiguration, but was represented in vision as he will be when he shall "come in his kingdom."

Another objection.—"The soul is a spirit, therefore the soul may, with perfect consistency, dwell with God and angels, separate from the body."

Where is the proof "that the soul is a spirit?" If the soul is "*the man*" it is not a spirit. Besides the Scriptures keep up a uniform distinction between soul and spirit. But what is "a spirit?" Has it *shape?* Has it *substance?* Or, is it immaterial? That is, having no substance, or matter connected with it? If the latter, we beg to know how a spirit can be *seen?* Can *thought* be seen? Can *mind* be visible to the eye? These absurdities are involved in the common theory.

Once more it is objected.—"If the Saviour has declared that whosoever liveth and believeth in him shall never die; we are bound to believe him, see John 11: 26." Most certainly we do believe him. But did our Lord assert by such language that Lazarus was not *then dead.* If he was not dead, then he did not raise him from the dead. But he himself had declared, "Lazarus is dead," verse 14. The interpretation the objector gives to our Lord's words, verse 26, makes him contradict himself, and makes the miracle to be no miracle: that is—*the dead* was not raised, because Lazarus was not dead. But our Lord said he was dead, and he calls death *sleep.* He did not say Lazarus' *body* sleeps, but "*Lazarus* sleepeth," and "*Lazarus* is dead;" and let it be recollected that the objector admits, and contends, the soul is the *essential man;* then the soul was the *essential Lazarus;* and *Lazarus slept,* and was *dead,* our Lord being judge.

What then did our Lord mean when he said: "He that believeth in me shall never die"? He must be understood in one of two ways: *First* That such a person should not die *for ever,* or remain forever under the power of death, though they die as had Lazarus. The *original* admits, we believe, of this construction; so some of the commentators have rendered the words, and among them Dr. Clarke. The previous verse shows that this may be the meaning. Our Lord had said: "*I am the resurrection* and THE LIFE; he that believeth in me, though he were *dead,* yet SHALL HE LIVE:" *i. e.* he shall have a resurrection to life. Our Lord had told Martha that her "*brother* [not his body merely, but "*thy brother,*"] shall rise again;" he shall not always remain under the power of death; he shall not die *forever,* or, remain *always dead;* he "shall rise again." "And whosoever [not Lazarus only] liveth and believeth *in me* shall not die forever;" they shall live again, for "I am the resurrection and the life," and "in the resurrection at the last day" they shall live again. Such, we conceive, is the true meaning of our Lord's words, unless,—*second*—He had reference to those that should be "alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord," of whom Paul speaks, 1 Thess. 4: 15; such "shall never die." It is possible our Lord had reference to that class of believers, in the words under consideration; for that day had just been spoken of by Martha.

From this text then there is no evidence that a man is dead and alive at the same time; or, in other words, that a man *is dead,* but *not dead.* "In that very day his thoughts perish," is the

testimony of inspiration. See Psa. 146: 4. And "*the dead praise not the Lord.*" Psa. 115: 17. "In the grave," in "*sheol*"—the state of the dead—"there is *no knowledge.*" Eccl. 9: 10. Such testimony *is positive;* and no *inferential* conclusions can invalidate it. When a man is dead, he *is dead;* and were it not for the "*resurrection,*" even those "that have fallen asleep in Christ are perished." But they shall live again to "*die no more.*" Compare 1 Cor. 15: 16, 18, with Luke 20: 35, 36.

H. T. ANDERSON.

We are exceedingly pleased to see that this gentleman has so ably vindicated *some* of the things, "concerning the kingdom of God." The readers of "the Examiner" will appreciate the article to which we refer, under the caption, "*Study of Prophecy,*" taken from the "Christian Magazine," and edited by J. B. Ferguson, B. F. Hall, and T. Fanning. Mr. Anderson is far in advance of all his contemporaries in the "Reformation," as it is called, and his brethren will do well to listen to his faithful and lucid exposition of the subject of which he treats in the article before us. Perhaps they will learn from him, when the same views offered by another, would be rejected on account of the source from which they might emanate. At all events, the truth is proclaimed, and we therein rejoice; yea, and we will rejoice! The following is the article to which we refer. J. T. W.

While I have my doubts of a universal conflagration, I have no doubts of a change in the constitution of the present heavens and earth. I do most religiously believe the saying of the Saviour, "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the Earth." The song of the redeemed that John heard, ended with the words, "thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth." There is a strong feeling of attachment to the earth on the part of those who suffered here. So it would seem from this song of theirs. Sin has indeed brought upon our race and upon our earth curses, which have sadly injured both. The race has become degenerate and wicked; and this fair globe has suffered from the consequences of the sin of man. We have death, disease and pain; labour, sorrow and tears. But in that new state to which we hasten, there will be neither death, nor sorrow, nor crying, nor any more pain; and God shall wipe away every tear from our eyes. Not only so, but there will be God's tabernacle with man, a pure river of water of life clear as crystal, flowing out from the throne of God and the Lamb. On this river, there will be trees which will yield fruit every month; the fruit will be food and the leaves for medicine, or, as John says, for the healing of the nations. What a glorious state this will be.

But, turn from this for one moment, and tell me, what healing of the nations is this? Will the nations need healing in that state which John describes? And who are these kings that bring their glory and honor into this city? Surely there must be some mistake about our ideas of a future state. John's new heavens and earth cannot differ from Peter's, nor can the state described by either of these differ from that of which Ezekiel and Isaiah speak. There can be no difference between prophet and prophet, for all have one spirit. But has Isaiah spoken of a new heavens and earth? He has, and says, 66: 22: "For as the new heavens and new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that, from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord." Does not this look like the saying of John with respect to the nations bringing their glory and honor into it. Such was the case in a less degree in Solomon's reign, when the kings around him brought gifts to the temple. There will be a healing of the nations, let the wise men say what they will of it. So says the Lord by his servant John. It is written, and we cannot unwrite nor reverse it. Make it intellectual, moral, physical: still it is healing. Now on the generally received opinion, that there will be, in that state, none but the resurrected, how can they need healing? I answer, they have no need of healing, for they are the inhabitants of the city; and they have no death nor pain, but are like the angels of God. And why this tree of life? Shall the resurrected eat of the fruit? I answer yes: for the Saviour says to the church at Ephesus, "to him that overcometh, will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." But for whom are these leaves? I answer, *for the nations.* So says the testimony. Then, when the Tabernacle of God is with men, there will be nations of the earth who will need healing. Let the Doctors make of this what they can. If they spiritualize, then it is spiritual healing. There is no escape. From all this, I infer [?] that there will be no such universal conflagration as we are wont to hear of. For if this universal conflagration takes place, and none but the immortals shall remain, then why have leaves to heal, when there are no maladies?

Let the reader remember that Isaiah and Ezekiel were Jews; that Peter and John were Apostles of the circumcision and descendants of this same family. Let the reader also remember that one spirit taught these four men, and that they all write in the Oriental style, that Peter was at the Babylon in Assyria, the very centre of the settlement of the Jews, when he wrote, and that he wrote for the Jewish believers; and, then, with all these facts before him, he will be able to comprehend what he wrote. And let any one take heed how he calls in question the fact of Peter's being at Babylon in Assyria. But this, by the way; Isaiah says of Jerusalem, "the nation and kingdom that shall not serve thee, shall perish." Again: "I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations." And again: "The sun shall no more be thy light by day, neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee: but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. Thy sun shall no more go down; thy people shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land forever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands that I may be glorified." Now as Peter, John, Isaiah and Ezekiel describe the same new heavens and earth, and as we find in Isaiah, Ezekiel and John nations subject to the holy people, we cannot conclude that that burning of which Peter speaks, is one of a universal char-

acter, or so extensive as to involve the nations of the earth: for then, verily, would there be no nations to subjugate. So, you perceive, that the new heavens of Peter and John being the same, the burning must take place prior to their existence. But in the new heavens and earth of John, Isaiah and Ezekiel (this last does not mention new heavens and earth; but the holy city, the waters and tree of life) we find the nations subjugated. Therefore, (I think you must permit this "therefore,") there can be no such burning as will involve the nations of the earth. I think, with all due deference to those who think differently, that the wisdom of the wise has failed them on this point. Remember that I have said, I believe in a change in the physical constitution of the present heavens and earth. Moreover, I believe that the Lord Jesus will be revealed, taking vengeance, by flames of fire, on them that know not God, and who obey not the gospel. This I religiously believe and teach. But I am constrained to interpret Peter so as to harmonize with the old prophets, and with John. Had I time, I would here quote from Moses and the prophets, the predictions relative to the land of Canaan; not the land only, but the heavens above that land, and perhaps we might find wondrous things out of the law, the prophets and the Psalms. But not to detain the reader with further remarks on that subject, I will introduce to his consideration a subject of another kind, but bearing upon the present one. First, then, a question: Is the Messiah an heir of any thing yet to be possessed? If so, what is that thing? Paul says, we are heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. This joint-heirship has some future bearing; something is yet to be developed. Is the Messiah now on the throne of David, or the throne of his Heavenly Father? On the answer to this question hangs the hope of Israel, and of the Christian. If it can be shown that Christ is not on David's throne, then the idea of a spiritual Millennial reign vanishes "like the baseless fabric of a vision." Let me try the answer to that question. First, I remark, that the passage in the 2d of Acts, 30th verse, is not authorized. The words "*to kata sarka anasteesein ton Christon*," belong not to the text. In the next place, I will quote from the Saviour's words, Rev. 3: 21—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in *my* throne, even as I also overcome, and am set down with my Father on his throne." There is a throne which he calls his, on which he will hereafter sit. Open, now, Isaiah, and read 9: 6, 7: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The Father of the Everlasting Age, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, *upon the throne of David*, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this." Well, then, the throne of David is his by inheritance, and he must yet sit upon it. He is the seed of David according to the flesh, and no other one can ever reign over the house of Jacob. Luke 1: 32. 33: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest. And the Lord God shall give him the throne of his Father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." This needs no comment. The language is clear, simple and plain. I say no one but he can reign over the Jewish people. Where is their Priesthood, and their kingly line? They are both lost *to them* long since, but safely preserved for them in the person of Christ. How consoling this promise. I care not to enter into the difficulties of dark sayings. This is plain. He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever. And Peter said, lo, we have left all and followed thee, what shall we have therefore? Jesus said to them, "Verily I say unto you, that you, which have followed me, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory in the Renovation, shall sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." This will be the portion of the Apostles, and every one that overcomes will sit with him on his throne. This is the consummation to which we hasten. He will have a throne of his own, of which he is the sole heir, which no one else can occupy, but which he will share with the faithful. When? In the Renovation, when the fulness of the Gentiles comes in; when the man of sin is destroyed, when the Israelites turn away from ungodliness, when the times of the restitution of all things shall come. Then will he sit on the throne of his glory, and the kingdom, and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High. Then shall the moon be confounded and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously. "At that time shall they call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord; and all nations shall be gathered to it, to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem." Jeremiah 3: 17. I did not conclude the quotation. "Neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart. For the Lord will comfort Zion: he will comfort all her waste places, and he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord; joy and gladness shall be found therein, thanksgiving and the voice of melody." Isaiah 5: 13.

I may at some future time give my view of Peter's 3d chapter. I have not entered into that subject, nor do I think it necessary now. I had long listened for some interpretation, which would cause that portion to harmonize with the other three that I mentioned, but my ears have not heard it from any quarter. The facts that I mentioned alone are important. Peter did not write for the Gentiles, and I think his language is understood only by those who give such an interpretation as will harmonize with Isaiah, Ezekiel and John, as well as other prophets. Be it known, that he wrote his letter a short time prior to the overthrow of Jerusalem, when that whole land, city and nation, were threatened by the Romans. The minds of the Jewish people were no doubt sadly perplexed with the coming vengeance, and needed all the aid that the Apostle could give. There is something exceeding sad to my mind, (what must it have been to that of a Jew?) in the whole of the 4th chapter of his first letter: but particularly in the 17th verse: "But the end of all things is at hand." They sound like the knell of the departing glory of the Jewish age. Imagine to yourself the homeless wanderer, driven from his own land, persecuted for his religion, which his Saviour had given; he has taken his last look at

the glorious temple, the city of a thousand years and more, and the centre of all that was loved on earth. The sound of war is in the land, the rumors of the approaching Roman host, the coming desolation, the end of which he knew not, all come before him; and then these sad and solemn words, "the end of all things is at hand." "A fire is kindled in my wrath which shall burn to the lowest hell." See Deuteronomy. These awful words must have struck deep into the Jewish heart. But it is a sad theme. I'll turn from it with a quotation. "Ye shall no more see me until you say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The time I trust is not far distant. The Lord hasten the day. Nevertheless, says Peter, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth *Righteousness*. How striking this word, when contrasted with the excessive wickedness and sinfulness of the then existing Jewish nation. But enough for the present.

THE TWENTY-THREE HUNDRED DAYS.

By Dr. John Fondey.

Br. Storrs:—About eighteen months ago, I addressed you a few letters giving you the result of my investigations in reference to prophecy, which I designed simply as suggestions for a more able and extended consideration by you than I could give them; one of the chief results of which inquiries was, that the twenty-three hundred days were literal days, and yet future. The twelve hundred and ninety, and thirteen hundred and thirty-five days, were also regarded in the same light. Time, and further reflection, have deepened my original impressions of the correctness of these views; and with the view to elicit truth, and excite others to a thorough investigation of this subject, I present them for the consideration of all who love the study of prophecy.

The host spoken of in the eighth chapter Daniel, is conceded by most of us, I believe, to refer to the Jewish people. This chapter gives a desoription of several monarchies which were to be the agents permitted by God to chastise the Jews. Babylon being soon to pass away, is not mentioned. Persia, Greece, and the divisions of the Greek kingdom, are spoken of. But the principal character (for the little horn is, I conceive, an individual, and my authority for recognizing him as such, besides other arguments afforded by the other prophets, is drawn from Daniel 11: 36, where the action of this king are again noticed. It matters little, however, whether this be a king or kingdom here referred to, for the two others are closely connected,) is a little horn which springs up in the latter time of the kingdom of the divided Grecian Empire, and who, after accomplishing great things, is finally broken without hand. By comparing the different parts of this chapter together, it will be readily seen that the little horn, and the transgression of desolation, are identical. In the thirteenth verse, the daily is spoken of. This I believe to mean the Jewish daily sacrifices which are yet to be restored after the Jews shall have built a temple prior to the advent of Christ. This could be proved from the prophets, but I only speak of it now in passing to explain the twenty-three hundred days. These Jewish daily sacrifices and the transactions of this little horn, who is to be an active agent in inflicting judgment on the Jews, are to occupy a period of twenty-three hundred days. These days I believe to be literal, and I will now give my reasons for this opinion, leaving it to others to decide for themselves whether they are of any value.

The argument is simple, and founded on the peculiarity of the words spoken by the angel while obeying the command in the sixteenth verse, to make Daniel understand the vision. In obedience to this command, he tells him to "understand, O Son of Man, for AT THE TIME OF THE END SHALL BE THE VISION." He does not say the vision of twenty-three hundred days shall begin with the commencement of the seventy weeks, which idea our advent brethren held out so valiently for, and many yet do, and as long as they do so will only be perpetually disappointed; nor three hundred, or one thousand years hence—but mark the phraseology—he says at the *time of the end*, which is somewhere about the time of Christ's second coming, *this vision shall be*. That passage seems to me a plain passage, and I wonder that I myself and others have stumbled over it so long—it shows that we are not to look for those twenty-three hundred days UNTIL THE TIME OF THE END. That time of the end is, I believe yet future, but as I am only considering the literality of the days spoken of in this chapter, I shall pass on to the next argument on this point.

In the nineteenth verse the angel says: "Behold I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation, for at the time appointed the end shall be." Let us analyze these words—at the time appointed (the conclusion of the twenty-three hundred days,) the end of the indignation should be. But will the indignation end on the Jews until Christ comes? No, for when he appears the Jews will be in such a time of trouble as never was and never again should be. This is not, however, the strongest point in this verse. But this is: "Behold I will make thee know what shall be in the LAST END of the indignation." This is the burden of the vision—this is what the angel comes to tell him about, viz:—the events connected with the time of Jacob's trouble, and which is yet future. Is that *last end* of the indignation, twenty-three hundred literal days, or is it twenty-three hundred years long? I believe it to be twenty-three hundred literal days. The whole period of the indignation of God on the Jews was to be seven times, or two thousand five hundred and twenty years. At the time Daniel had this vision, but one or two hundred years of this indignation had been inflicted on the Jews, leaving the most of the seven times punishment yet unfulfilled. Now this twenty-three hundred days finishes up the indignation on the Jews, and is said to be the last end of it. If the twenty-three hundred days are not literal days, but refer to years, I would ask if *twenty-three hundred* years would not be *a long last end* of *twenty-five hundred and twenty years*—the *end* would be nearly as long as the *whole period* spoken of.

Mark, he does not say I will make thee know what shall be in the beginning, nor the middle, nor the latter part of the indignation, "but I will make thee know what shall be in the LAST END of it, for at the time appointed (twenty-three hundred days,) the end shall be." The common sense meaning of words, will, it seems to me, warrant no other explanation of this verse, nor the one previously spoken of, than that the vision shall be at the time of the end, and that the last end of the indignation

is not more than twenty-three hundred literal days in length.

I have spoken of the twenty-three hundred days as making the duration of the last end of the indignation. This time, however is, I believe, divided into two parts, one of twelve hundred and sixty days, (which can be proved from the prophecies,) during which the transgression of desolation is to be treading down, which leaves for the other a period of one thousand and forty days, during which the Jewish daily sacrifices are to be offered. Both these periods added together, give us the whole duration of the vision. The question of the saint in the thirteenth verse, included both these events. The time of the continuance of the daily, and also the transactions of the little horn, or the transgression of desolation, and the time of their complete termination, was to mark the time of the complete cessation of the indignation on the Jewish people.

An objection might be started to these views, that as the angel gives an account of the different monarchies, they must be included in the period of the twenty-three hundred days, and consequently those days must be years. But if we look carefully at the explanation of the angel, we shall find that the burden of it referred to the actions of the little horn—the events connected with the last end of the indignation. Besides, I conceive the description of the other monarchies to have been given simply as an introduction to the subject matter of the vision, viz: the movements of the little horn. To illustrate this. When the historian gives us the history of a king, he does not immediately commence with the events of his reign, but traces his descent, and then goes on to give an account of his acts. So in this chapter we have the descent of the little horn as connected with those persecuting kingdoms given; he is shown to have sprung out of one of the four divisions of the Grecian Empire, and then his acts are given at length. I was pleased to see that you had made an advancement towards the views of the literality of the days in Daniel's prophecies. In the April number, subject Prophetic Periods, No. 6, you conclude the twelve hundred and ninety, and thirteen hundred and thirty-five days, to be literal, but the term translated twenty-three hundred days, you say is different from that of the twelve hundred and ninety, and thirteen hundred and thirty-five days, and therefore, I suppose, consider them, in distinction from these last, to be years. But in Daniel 12: 11, it speaks of its being twelve hundred and ninety days from the time when the daily shall be taken away to set up the abomination that maketh desolate. In Daniel 8: 13 and 14, it speaks of the daily and transgression of desolation containing altogether twenty-three hundred days. These two dailies and transgressions of desolation in the eighth and twelfth chapters, are evidently the same; and if your twenty-three hundred days are years, and twelve hundred and ninety days are days, you will have days cut off years, which spoils the harmony of prophetic dates. But if, as I believe them to be, the twenty-three hundred days are days, your twelve hundred and ninety days can commence somewhere in the duration of the first mentioned number, no violence is done to prophetic periods, and all is harmonious and intelligible. Another idea which presents itself to my view, is drawn from the twenty-sixth verse of the eighth chapter; the vision is there said to be shut up for many days' Of course the twenty-three hundred days were not to commence until a very remote period.

The little horn in this chapter, I do not consider Papacy, but an anti-Christian power, yet to be manifested identical with the King in Dan. 11: 36, and the Russian Emperor (the great Gog) who shall last reign, I conceive to be the person indicated. The time, times and half of Daniel 7, are also yet future, harmonizing with the twelve hundred and sixty days during which the little horn of the eighth chapter is to be flourishing. The little horn (Papacy,) of the seventh chapter, makes war for twelve hundred and sixty days on the nominal Christian church, while the little horn or Russian Emperor of the eighth chapter, makes war for the same length of time on the nominal Jewish church; the two persecuting both the natural branches and the graft.

ALBANY, N. Y., Oct., 1848.

LETTER FROM BR. MANSFIELD.

BUFFALO, N. Y., Oct 9th, 1848.

BR. STORRS:—I find in your monthly paper much that interests me; especially in your articles relating to the question of man's condition in death, and the future state. When I first gave my attention to the advent doctrine in 1842, while in Cleveland with our departed brother Fitch, I fell in with your "Six Sermons;" and simultaneously with my investigation of the advent doctrine, I examined the subject matter of those discourses and became assured of the general truth of your positions. I have, it is true, found apparent obstacles in the way, but not more than are met in attempting a solution of the advent doctrine—the doctrine of sanctification—human rights, &c., &c. I have always endeavoured to maintain the truth upon the questions referred to, contained in those sermons; and have never felt that by so doing I violated any of my obligations to others, with whom I agreed on the great and absorbing theme of the second advent, who differed with me on the subjects of *death and immortality*. I feel now, as I have in time past, that the doctrine of the speedy personal coming of Jesus, is the sublime and thrilling theme of the heralds of Christ in this age of the world; but that all other truths should occupy their appropriate place in the arch of truth; assured that—although the keystone be in its place, the arch is imperfect while any truth is left out, and the fabric is in danger of falling. That the *dead are unconscious—and the wicked are not immortal*, I firmly believe, and therefore think the arch of truth incomplete without those views; and I am persuaded that the mass of advent believers entertain the same sentiments, though many do not.

I have never had occasion to change my views on the Jew question; but think the Millennarian scheme furnishes no satisfactory scriptural argument to sustain the idea of a mixed state in the millenium; and that no explanation has been given, from scripture, as to the termination of this mixed state, nor of the process by which the *mortals* living during that period shall become *immortal*. Accept assurances of Christian love, and believe me

Truly, yours in hope,

L. DELOS MANSFIELD.

Br. M. has travelled extensively in preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and returned last May from his arduous labours in the West Indies.—*Ed. Ex.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS, HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER, 1848. No. 12.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET,
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

THE MIND.

SECOND REPLY TO J. T. WALSH.

DEAR SIR—I wish to call your attention, and the attention of our readers, to a few points now settled.

1. You admit that it is not the brain that thinks. That none of the mental or moral powers are to be ascribed to it. That the "aggregate of powers" you call the mind, cannot be said to be powers of the brain,—that it would be ridiculous to say that the brain reasoned, hoped, feared, loved or hated.

2. Hence the destruction of the brain does not in itself destroy that which thinks, and puts forth mental power.

3. That mind is not a thinking, reasoning power. That these exercises are not the exercises of the mind, but they *constitute* the mind.

4. That these powers are to be referred to man as an organized being, and result from his *organization*, and are put forth in consequence of, and by *virtue* of the brain.

5. That there is no such *essence*, *entity*, or *substance*, as mind, to which we may justly ascribe mental or moral power, action, or affection.

And hence you must admit, and maintain, that thought is a necessary, mechanical result of an organized, living, physical machine, called man, and when the organization is *disturbed* or destroyed, thought, the result of organization, ceases, or is deranged. I hope I have not misunderstood you, and do not intend misrepresentation of your views.

The conclusion seems inevitable, to me, that thought is a mechanical result, and man an irresponsible machine, on the ground assumed by you in this discussion. Organization and cerebral motion produces thought, and if there is no mind presiding over this organized being, or machine, then man is no more free than the solar system; he moves on and thinks and purposes by reason of his organization, till the machine is out of repair, and then ceases to think, and is no more. I have been led into this inadvertently, and will here state, that one of the chief objections to the material view, is, that man is made an irresponsible machine and not a *moral* agent.

On the ground I maintain, the mind controls, by its free volitions, the movements of this organized body, in which it resides; and the senses are only windows through which it looks out of its prison upon the world of matter.

6. When you affirm that the mind cannot think without a brain, you put assertion in the place of proof. Do angels think by reason of a brain? Does God, whose image man is, think by reason of a brain? To say that man cannot *manifest* thought, and hold connexion with the outward world, when the senses are locked up, is saying very little indeed.

Most persons believe that God can commune with, and influence the human mind, without addressing any of the senses.

Facts show that there *can* be perceptions without the *use* of eyes. With the eyes closely bandaged, in a dark room, persons have been known to read a book they never saw, and tell the time of day by a watch.

It is now perfectly settled, that what are termed idiots can be educated. A school is soon to be started in Massachusetts; a teacher has been selected, and is now abroad preparing himself for his task.

I have before observed, that mental power continues to increase long after the whole physical organization has reached maturity.

What are we to understand by the term *man*, as used in your articles, and to whom you ascribe all mental and moral phenomena. What is that man that thinks? Not any part of his physical system. Is it intended to embrace simply the whole physical frame? *I* see with my eye, hear with my ear. Now what is it that sees and hears? Not the eye nor ear, any more than the telescope or trumpet.

By a figure of speech, we say that the eye sees, the ear hears, the hand writes, but clearly they are only agents. Agents of what? Of the man; which being interpreted means—*the other parts of the physical organization*: that is, the organized man destitute of any property but matter, having nothing but a body, sees out of the eye, one part becoming the servant to all the others, and changing work, to to keep the bargain even.

Thus "the eye cannot say to the foot I have no need of thee," for when this organized being wishes to change localities, he uses his feet—when he wishes to speak, he uses his tongue, and so on: thus in turn each is the servant of the whole; a very important lesson to organized society is thus wrought out.

Man's identity resides not in his ever changing body, but in the mind. Paul says, he knew a man caught up to the third heavens—but whether in the body, or out of the body he did not know. Again, in another place, he speaks of being absent from the *body*, and present with the *Lord*, as co-existing facts. Clearly, the organized body is not the man, but something that can leave the body—be out of the body.

I have asserted, and again repeat, that according to your views it is the physical man that is born again, for this good reason, that man is wholly phy-

sical. You think that my position approaches the absurd, because you understand *me* to say that it is the *mind* that undergoes the change called the new birth. This would make the Lord say, "that except a *mind* be born again, it cannot see the Kingdom of God." Again, "except a mind be born of water and spirit, it cannot enter into the Kingdom of God."

"A *mind* born of water! What an idea!! So Mr. B.'s *mind has been born again*, but Mr. B. *himself has not!*"

Now, as you ridicule the idea of the *mind* being born again, it follows, of course, that you believe the body undergoes this change. You make this mistake in *respectable* company, for Nicodemus had the same opinion.

I grant, at once, that this change of mind, produces a new application and use of the physical organs, but I have yet to learn, that the change is not wholly a change of mind, "making a new heart and spirit," and in consequence of the control of the mind over the whole man, "the body is presented," &c.

But what is this, I am again tempted to ask, that presents the body? Not the mind. You reply at once, the man. But on your theory the *body is the man*, the *whole* of man—and hence *man*, the body, is to present the body "a living sacrifice."

But we need have no controversy as to what it is that is born again, for much as you ridicule the idea, your ridicule hits not me but the Bible.

Turn to John, 3d chapter, 3d and 6th verses—Nicodemus is astonished to hear it said that a *man* must be born again. Christ replies and adds, "that which is born of the spirit is SPIRIT." A spirit born again! A spirit born of water and spirit! What an idea!! But hold, these are the words of Christ, and here he tells us what he means by *man*, that must be born again.

I have no desire to burden the columns of your paper with long articles, and therefore omit many things. The challenge contained in your last, is accepted, in so far as to be perfectly willing to rest the whole question—Does the soul—mind—outlive the body—upon that text, but I cannot confine myself to that text on the main question. Now to the text.*

1. Observe that "body and soul," are in opposition to each other, and both substantives.

2. It is declared, that while men *can* kill the "body," they *cannot* kill the "soul," which is not true if the soul dies when the body dies.

3. It is declared that God can destroy both in hell, or, as Luke says, "hath power to cast into hell" *after death.*

We must understand by *hell* a place, and state of punishment after death. Now, on your interpretation, that the body means the *present* life, and the soul the *future* life, the text would read—"fear not them that kill the *present* life, but fear him, who after he hath killed, (the present life) hath power to destroy both the present and the future life in hell. Thus the *present life* is destroyed *twice.*

If this is your logic, it is not mine. I have only to say in conclusion, that leaving you to manage your side of the controversy as you please, I shall do the same on my part, always intending to be respectful in language.

Respectfully
WM. H. BREWSTER.

*Matt. 10: 28. Luke 12: 5.

RESPONSE TO MR. BREWSTER.

DEAR SIR—In your "points now settled" you make the same incorrect "inferences," which you made in all your previous articles. I now despair of any thing but misrepresentation on this subject, though, I doubt not, it is unintentional on your part. The "points" which you regard as "settled," are far from being so in my estimation; one or two of them, however, are not so objectional as the others. Imitating your example, I will also state certain "points" which I consider "settled" in previous articles, and "*post up*" the controversey to the present time.

1. *Man thinks, reasons, reflects, judges, compares, loves, fears, hopes, venerates and adores by means of his brain. The brain is the seat of those* ORGANS, *whose* FUNCTIONS *are above indicated.*

This meets your first "point."

2. "*The mental and moral powers,*" *while they are attributes of the* MAN, "*are to be ascribed to*" *the brain —they being* FUNCTIONS *of that instrument.* "*That the aggregate of powers,*" *I* "*call the mind,*" *are* "*powers*" *of the* MAN, *and* FUNCTIONS *of the brain; and that it would be ridiculous to say the brain reasoned, hoped, feared, loved or hated,*" *seeing that* THESE, *while they are* FUNCTIONS *of that organ, are in reality* ATTRIBUTES *of the* MAN—*organized and living, and not of his brain abstractly or when dissected out.*—"*Hence the destruction of the brain does*" "*in itself destroy that which thinks, and puts forth mental power;*' *because the* "*destruction*" *of the brain—the instrument of thought—involves the destruction of the* THINKER—MAN.

This meets your second "point."

3. *Your third* "*point,*" *while it is not expressed in my language, may pass current without further notice.*

4. *Your fourth* "SETTLED *point*" *is an* ADMITTED *refutation of your first, and part of the second* '*point.*' *That these powers are to be referred to man as an organized being, and result from his organization, and are put forth in consequence of, and by virtue of the brain.*" *Of course, then, the* "*destruction*" *of the brain, is the* "*destruction*" *of that* "*which thinks!*"

So much for your fourth "point."

5. *Your fifth* "*point,*" "*that there is no such* ESSENCE, ENTITY, *or* SUBSTANCE, *as mind, to which we may justly ascribe mental or moral power, action or affection,*" *must be received with a qualification.* In relation to *Man* it is true; and it may be true of *angels*, and of *Christ*; but we do not affirm it of "Him who dwells in light inaccessible." I apprehend that there is much error in the world, in relation to *spiritual bodies*; and I cannot conceive of any being *thinking* without an *instrument* of some sort, but Him who is *uncreated, unorganized*, and *self-existant!*

Thus far we have "posted up" this controversy. The inference you draw from the "settled points" is utterly at variance with the premises. I neither "admit" nor "maintain," "that thought is a necessary, mechanical result of an organized, living, physical machine, called man. "Moral and mental" *functions* cannot be ascribed to "mechanical" laws. Electro-magnetism, modified by the laws of the living organism, of which the brain may be styled the "battery," and the nerves the "*conductors,*" contains the principles by which this question is solved. *There is not a single faculty of man, moral, mental, or animal, which cannot be made to manifest its function,* WITH INCREASED POWER, *by means of*

electro-magnetism! This has been done a thousand times! *I have both witnessed and performed it!* MAGNETIC VIBRATION, PRODUCING "CEREBRAL MOTION" EXPLAINS IT.

Will Mr. Brewster tell us how these effects are produced, if the brain be not the seat of these functions? If they be attributes of the "immortal soul," why are they influenced by magnetism? Is immortality governed by magnetic laws?

As it respects "human responsibility," it is abundantly established by what you are pleased to call "the material view." The brain, as the *sensorium* of man, is made up of various *organs*, each organ possessing a distinct *function*. These functions are *moral, mental, and animal*. The moral and mental should govern the animal. Man, possessing the power of *will*, is "responsible" for the right use of all these faculties. They have a legitimate, and an illegitimate use. They are to be *used*, but not *abused*. Every moral law in the Bible is directed against their abuse. As this is your principal objection, I will enlarge upon it. Man possesses an organ—cerebral organ, I mean,—which prompts him to adore. Combining its influence with his *will*, he determines to worship something. If he is not enlightened, he will worship idols; but if the light of Truth has illuminated his understanding, he will *respect* men and "*worship* God," which is its legitimate function. Hence its unlawful exercise is forbidden—"Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

This illustration is applicaple to every animal and moral faculty of man, so that he is, in the fullest sense, a "responsible agent." He is responsible for the right use of all the powers, with which God has endowed him. But if man has an "immortal soul," or if his mind be a distinct "essence," "entity" or "substance," capable of life, consciousness and intelligence, when separate from the body; then this "soul" or "essence," which you call the mind, is *alone* "responsible," and the *man*, as such, has no "responsibility." If a man were to strike you, or slander your character, would you hold his "immortal" part "responsible," or the man himself? Am I to understand that your "immortal mind" is "responsible," for what you write, and that the *man*—Mr. Brewster—has no "responsibility" at all? Why hang a man, for the sins of his "immortal soul?" This is punishing the innocent for the guilty! Either let a man go free, or punish the real offender. But, sir, so sure as God is just, he, as well as men, will hold *the* MAN, and not his body, his mind, or his "immortal soul," "responsible" for his evil deeds! *The Man*, THE WHOLE MAN, AND NOTHING BUT THE MAN, *is responsible before God!*

You say that "on the ground" you "maintain, the mind controls, by its free volitions, the movements of this organized body, in which it resides: and the senses are only windows through which it looks out of its prison upon the world of matter." Here, for the first time, you have given us a synopsis of your theory! Let me analyze it:

1. "The mind controls, by its volitions, the movements of this organized body."
2. It "resides" in the body, as in a "prison."
3. "The senses are only windows, through which it looks out upon the world of matter."

According to what you "maintain," then, the "immortal mind" *only*, has "free volitions;" and this "mind" "controls" the "movements of this organized body." *Immortality*, then, "controls the movements" of that which is *mortal*. Why is it, Mr. Brewster, that these "movements" are so irregular, eccentric, defective, deranged and insane? "God only hath immortality," and he only bestows it upon his creatures. He is the fountain of this attribute in *angels*, and will be its source in *men*. But it "resides" in the body. Where is its location?—This was asked in my last article, but you gave no answer. Does it "reside" in the brain? If so, what is it? What is it like? Again, it is in "prison!"—Pythagorianism to perfection! Immortality in "prison—looking through windows upon the world of matter!" But suppose all these "windows," the "senses," are closed, then it cannot see out "upon the world of matter." All is blind, all darkness, all "confusion worse confounded!" Again, you say, "when" I "affirm that the *mind* cannot think without a brain," I "put assertion in the place of proof." Now, I have not said that "the *mind* cannot think without a brain;" but I have said that *man* cannot; the proofs of which have been given abundantly in previous articles,—proofs which you have failed to invalidate. When you have answered the arguments already submitted, it will be time enough to advance others.

You ask—"Do angels think by reason of a brain?" I answer angels are not the subject of discussion; but so far as we can judge from analogy, and from what is revealed concerning them, they certainly think by means of some instrument. They have an immortal and incorruptible organization, but this does not preclude the possession of an organ of thought. But, be this as it may, it has nothing to do with the question before us.

Again, you ask, "Does God, whose image man is, think by means of a brain?" I have already answered this question, but I repeat, that God is unorganized, uncreated and self-existant; and the laws of thought, which govern *mortal man*, are not applicable to the uncreated God. Man was created in the image of the *Elohem*—the *holy ones*—the angels; and all we know of them, as taught in the scriptures, confirms the account given by Moses.

Once more, you observe, that, "To say that man cannot *manifest* thought, and hold connection with the *outward world*, when the senses are locked up, is to say very little indeed."

Ah! a while since you told us that the "mind looked out upon the world of matter, through the *senses*—the windows" of the soul; but now you tell us the mind may "hold connection with the outward world, when" these "windows"—the "senses are *locked* up!" Do you mean the "five senses," or the moral and mental which are within the brain? "Most persons," you say, "believe God can commune with, and influence the human mind without addressing any of the senses." If you mean the five external "senses," I grant its truth; but if you mean the moral and intellectual, I deny it.

"Facts show that there *can* be perceptions without the *use* of eyes. With the eyes closely bandaged, in a dark room, persons have been known to read a book they never saw, and tell the time of day by a watch." True; but this does not favor your views of the subject. Cataleptic patients can do this; so can magnetic subjects. In the first case, it is a *diseased* state of the nervous system; in the latter, it is superinduced by magnetic influence. The *brain* is *magnetic, electric* and *phos-*

phoretic. These make it *luminous*. When the magnetism of the atmosphere and the brain are in *equilibrio*, the *electro-magnetic light*, "the eyes being closed," passes through the *cranium*, excite the *optic nerve* to *vibration*, and thus the person can see through a *magnetic medium*. Destroy the *optic nerve*, however, and you destroy *all* sight. We now come to a most astounding development! Here it is. "It is now perfectly settled, that what are termed idiots, can be educated. A school is soon to be started in Massachusetts, a teacher has been selected, and is now abroad preparing himself for his task."

Well, reader, I thought I had investigated this subject; that I had learned *something* concerning the constitution of man; but, really, if Mr. Brewster be right, I am in worse than Egyptian darkness!

"*Idiots to be educated!*" *Then* they will be "*idiots*" *no longer!* Let the earth rejoice! Let the inhabitants of the earth shout! and the heavens echo back the sound, for the world is now to be rid of all "idiots!" I would smile, but the subject is too grave!

But, seriously, I regard the scheme as utopian and "idiotic." You might as well try to teach a monkey to be serious, a horse to adore, or an ass to pray, as to teach a *congenital* "*idiot*." I speak not of those who are *partial* "*idiots*," but of those who are completely so. Those who are *merely idiotic*, may be educated, in a limited sense, to the extent of their *educability*. But *congenital* "idiots" are hopelessly doomed to ignorance. When a man is educated, his *moral* and *mental* powers are brought out, trained and properly directed. Before you can educate a man, he must possess powers to be educated. The "idiot" has them not, and education cannot *create* them. Before you can educate an "idiot" you must *re-organize* him physically. No system of training can do this.

"A school is soon to be started." And a "teacher is now abroad preparing himself for his task!" A mighty "task" it is! He may go "abroad;" he may travel all over Europe, and the world; he may visit those ancient seats of learning in Greece, Rome, and Egypt; he may consult the eastern magi, astrologers, soothsayers and diviners; he may wade through the ponderous volumes of antiquity, and consult the wisdom of all ages, and even then he will not be qualified for his "task."

You ask, "what are we to understand by the term *man*, as used in your articles?" I thought I had been sufficiently explicit, but as you seem not to understand me, I will, *for the last time, in this discussion*, define man. Man is an organized being; composed of bones, muscles, tendons, nerves, veins, arteries, brain, &c., &c. He is made up of body, limbs, abdominal and thoracic viscera. All these are chemically organized. The organization being complete, it is put in motion, and kept in motion by *electro-magnetism*. Life is thus developed. This *electro-magnetism* is modified by a *vital* chemical action, and is then termed "*nervo-vital fluid*." The *brain* is its "battery," the *nerves* its "conductors." The brain is a *congeries of organs*. They manifest *animal, moral*, and *mental functions*. "The life of the flesh," which is *electro-magnetic*, "*is in the blood*." Man breathes electricity, light, oxygen, &c. All these *elements*, physically, electrically, magnetically and chemically combined, *by a process known only to God*, he calls *man*. "The first man was *of* the earth—*earthy*"—*animal*. This is all I can say now on this point; it would take a volume to elaborate it.

But you ask, "What is that man that thinks?" I have answered this question several times; why put it again? Time and space are too precious for such repetitions.

In the remainder of your philosophical argument there is nothing new. You go over the same ground again and again. 'Tis true you vary the questions—you change your language, but they are the same still. Like one in a "tread-mill," you continue to step without advancing. When you present a new argument, I will notice it; but until you do, I must be excused from travelling over the same ground every month.

With these remarks, I leave the *philosophical* part of this subject, to attend to your *scriptural* allusions.

Paul teaches a lesson which you seem not to have learned, although you quote him. In 1 Cor. xii. he says: "For the *body*," (the *man*) "is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they *many members, yet but* ONE BODY?" Thus "God hath tempered the body together" The *man* is *made up* of the *body* and its *members*, as I have before explained. There is no "*schism*" in it, but it is a perfect whole. It is not "one member," but many. All the parts of the body and man are perfectly adapted to each other. I thank you for referring to this illustration of the Apostle. It is just the thing.

"Man's identity," you say, "resides not in his ever-changing body, but in the mind." If this be so, how is it that personal "identity" is deranged? "Identity resides in the mind," and that "mind" is "immortal;" how then does it become destroyed? Is an "immortal mind" susceptible of any sort of derangement? But the "body" is no more "changing" than the mind. What in common *parlance* we call the mind, is as "ever-changing" as the "body." "Identity," then, according to your theory, cannot "reside in the mind." The truth is, there is a cerebral organ which gives rise to *personal* "*identity*," and supplies *the* I *of consciousness*. This can, and sometimes does become diseased and deranged, producing *double consciousness*, &c.

Your allusion to Paul's vision is too slight and vague, for me to notice it at present. When you make it the basis of a regular argument, I will give it a full reply.

Your assertions concerning the new birth, may pass for what they are worth. He must be extremely ignorant of the truth, who does not know that the new birth is a moral or spiritual change. The Lord Jesus taught this in the very quotation which you have used to sustain your theory. "That which is born of spirit, is spirit," or *spiritual*; not fleshly or carnal. Jesus did not say, "that which is born of the spirit," is the *human spirit*, mind, or soul: but *spiritual*. You might as well say that that which is "born of God," is God, as to affirm

what you have, concerning being born of the spirit. You again repeat the misrepresentation of a "change in the body," when a "man is born again." This you have done so often, while I have as often refuted it, that I shall not pay further attention to it, other than to observe, that you, yourself, are "in *respectable* company" in misunderstanding, like Nicodemus, the *nature* and *process* of the new birth.

In your next paragraph you grant me that, which in the one just noticed you deny me—*that is the moral change in the whole man*, when he is "born again."

But, passing over all minor points, I come now to the text upon which I proposed to rest this controversy. You say my "challenge" is accepted, but you are not willing to rest the "main question" on that text. Well, sir, let it be as you will. But to the text itself. Matt. x. 28: "And fear not them who *kill* the body, but are not able to *kill* the *soul;* but rather fear him who is able to *destroy* both *soul* and *body in hell*."

The parallel of this is found in Luke xii. 4, 5. "And I say to you, my friends, be not afraid of them that *kill* the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom you shall fear: Fear him, who after he hath *killed*, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say to you, fear him."

1. "And fear not them who *kill* the body." The word "kill," in this sentence, in the original, signifies to "*murder*," to *put to death* with an *evil purpose*. "But are not able to *kill* the *soul*." In this sentence it signifies to "*destroy*," "*to bring to nought*."

"But rather fear him who is able to *destroy* both *soul* and *body* in hell." The word "*destroy*," in this sentence, signifies to "*dismiss from life*,—to bring to *nought*." Is it not evident, then, that the Lord exhorted his disciples not to fear those who merely had the power to commit "*murder*," or to "kill the body;" but had not power to "*dismiss from life*," or "*to bring to nought*," in the sense of precluding the possibility of *living again?*

2. This is clear from the fact, that he commands them "rather to fear him," who not only had the power of life and death here, but who also had power to "*destroy*," "*dismiss from life*," or "*bring to nought*," "both soul and body in *gehenna*."

This view is confirmed by the passage from Luke, where the Lord says: "Fear not them that *kill*" or "*murder*" "the body, BUT AFTER THAT HAVE NO MORE THAT THEY CAN DO." They cannot preclude the resurrection to *eternal life;* "for our *life* is hid with Christ in God."

I could say much on this topic, but must wait another month, as this article is already too long.

In conclusion, I would suggest the propriety of narrowing down this discussion to a few prominent points, in order to save time and space.

With much respect, I am yours,
J. T. WALSH.

"PRIDE OF OPINION."

We clip the following excellent sentiments from the editorial department of the "True Wesleyan," of New York city, a paper we are as well pleased with as with any of our exchanges, though we differ from it on many points.

"Men are often too proud to confess their errors or to change when they are convinced that they are wrong. There is nothing more absurd than man's pride of opinion. For men to persist in an error, after they are convinced, lest, by giving it up, they should show themselves to have been mistaken, is madness. There is one thought that should humble this pride of opinion. It is this: all men have been and still are more or less mistaken in many important matters. To this we should add the fact that wherein we are in error, if we do not correct ourselves, others will be sure to correct us, as human society progresses towards its higher destiny. When we look at ourselves as individuals, we see that we have arrived at our present position by a succession of changes, and yet we are ashamed to change. The whole path of life, from the cradle to the grave, is strewed with cast off ideas and opinions. We have taken up an idea and brought it on with us for a time, and cherished it as truth, but after bringing it for some time, we threw it down and picked up another, or picked up two in place of it, for most men increase their ideas. These were retained for a time and then cast off for others, and in this way we have arrived at our present positions, changing at every step, and yet all the time ashamed to change, lest the world should know that we had been mistaken. The same is true of society in general, for the changes of individuals effect changes in society, and all the changes of society are but the changes of individuals that compose society. The present state of the arts and sciences has been arrived at by a succession of changes. The principles of the several sciences which have been settled by one generation, have been rejected and exploded by the next, and yet men are proud of their opinions. All improvement involves change, and yet men are ashamed to change. If men will change from bad to good, and from good to better, the more rapid their changes, the better will it be for themselves and the world."

REPLY TO C. B. HOTCHKISS.

"QUERIES ON BAPTISM."

"QUES. 1." It is admitted by learned pedobaptists that the Greek word imports immersion. See G. Campbell's dissertation on the word. He admits that it ought to have been so translated. John could not well *immerse* by *sprinkling*. Surely he need not have gone to Enon "*because there was much water there*," if he only wanted to wet "a bunch of hysop." The sprinkling "described by Paul, Heb. 9: 19, is a sprinkling of *blood*, typical of the atoning blood of our blessed Lord. Our immersion in water is an appropriate emblem of our *burial* with Christ and and rising with him to newness of life. See Col. 2: 12. "*Buried* with him in baptism," &c.

"QUES. 2. John not only preached repentance, but the Gospel of Jesus Christ Mark prefaces his record of John's ministry with the words, "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ," Mark 1: 1. Paul confirms the same, Acts 19: 4. "John verily baptised with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, *that is on Christ Jesus*. "Behold (said John) the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!" I wish that all modern preachers preached the Gospel as

well as John. Surely the baptism of Christ and his apostles, John 3: 22, was connected with the preaching of "the Gospel of the kingdom."

"QUES. 3." It will not only "do to read it (baptizo) were immersed," but the fulfilment of the prediction Acts, 2: 2 to 4, requires it. When they were baptised with or in the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, they were immersed in the holy element, for "*it filled all the house where they were sitting.*" "In a *literal* fire" they were neither immersed or sprinkled. The prophet is not to be so understood.

"QUES. 4." Peter's hearers in the house of Cornelius were indeed baptised with or in the Holy Ghost. I see no objection to our friend's supposition that this *was* "the baptism of *fire* and the Holy Ghost." But the record of this whole case is fatal to his sentiments; giving in fact a clear affirmative to his question, "Is there any other baptism left for the christian dispensation but the baptism of the fire and of the Holy Ghost?" *After* they were baptised with the Holy Ghost, Peter said "can any man forbid WATER that these should not be baptised *which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?* And he commanded them to be baptised in the name of the Lord." Acts 10: 44-48. To suppose then that the baptism of the Holy Spirit supercedes the ordinance of immersion *in water* under the christian dispensation, is to "be wise above what is written" by the Spirit of Truth.

"QUES. 5." Baptism is not "the antitype" of Moses' sprinkling with blood. The blood of Jesus is the antitype of this. John never "*sprinkled* all the people." He did not *rantize* them. He baptised (i. e. immersed) them. As the sound like a mighty wind, and the cloven tongues fell on the disciples on the day of Pentecost when they were baptised with or in the Holy Ghost, it is proper to say of Peter's hearers, Acts 10, that when the Holy Ghost "fell on them," they were baptised in the same.

"QUES. 6." I agree with our friend on this question and think that John 3: 5, may be understood in a sense "different from literal water."

"QUES. 7." To suppose that the new birth insisted upon by our beloved Savior, refers to the time of our entering the kingdom at his second appearing, is to suppose that we are not the children of God until that period. We are not his children until we are begotten and born of him. John writes of those who received Christ, when on earth, as persons who were *then* born of God. John 1: 13. This phrase is not used in reference to our entering into the joy of our Lord at his glorious appearing.

"QUES. 8." With all due respect for the judgment of my friend, I really think the "probability" of *his* being "mistaken," is quite as "strong," as that those should be so, who were so inspired by the Holy Spirit to teach those things, and only those things which Christ commanded them, that they could say, "*He that knoweth God heareth us.*" 1 John 4: 6. In respect to circumcision "as touching the Gentiles which believe, we (said James) have written and conluded that they observe no such thing," &c. Acts 21: 25. In respect to the Jews there was no command for them to discontinue it at any particular time. The only case we read of any appostle practising it, is Paul's circumcising Timothy whose mother was a Jewess. He says, "circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing." He taught those who depended on it, that Christ would profit them nothing.

"QUES. 9." Whether there is, or is not "salvation without immersion," it was "benevolent in Paul to thank God that HE had baptised but two or three" *of the Corinthians*, so long as they were glorying in men, and saying "I am of Paul and I of Apollos." Paul did not thank God that he had baptised no more *of that particular church*, because baptism was not a duty, or because it is unimportant, but "lest any should say that (he) had baptised in his own name." 1 Cor. 1: 15. He prefered the honor of his divine Master to his own. By the declaration "for Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the gospel," we must understand that the annunciation of the glad tidings of salvation to a dying world, was the *principal* and *great* object of his mission. If he had no commission from Christ to baptize he could not have baptised at all; for that only which he "received from the Lord Jesus," he taught. See 1 Cor. 11: 23, Matt. 28: 19, 20.

"QUES. 10." The true answer to this question is found in the practice of the apostles. This practice proves that Matt. 28: 19 means immersion *in water*, which (as is evident from Acts 10: 44—48,) was not superceded by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. See also Acts 8: 36, 38. Acts 2: 38. This could not be the baptism of the Holy Ghost for this was promised them as a *subsequent* favor. Acts 8: 15 to 17 proves the same. The Samaritans were not baptised with the Holy Ghost by the laying on of the apostle's hands until some time after they were immersed in water by Philip.

Paul's act in Acts 19: 6 is not explanatory of the baptism mentioned in the 5th verse, but a *subsequent* act. Strictly speaking, neither the baptism of water nor the baptism of the Holy Ghost (in the scriptural sense of that phrase,) can save us. *The bestowment of miraculous gifts*, and not *the conversion of the soul to God*, is the true import of the baptism of the HolyGhost. The apostles were converted long before the day of Pentecost When they were then baptised with the Holy Ghost, they were furnished with miraculous gifts "and spake with other tongues." Acts 10: 44, 46, confirms this. It was *water* baptism which *emblematically* washed away Paul's sins. Acts 22: 16.

HENRY GREW.

As the foregoing article will probably close, for the present, the discussion on the subject of baptism, we take the liberty to dissent entirely from Br. Grew's position that the baptism "with the Holy Spirit" was being "immersed in the holy element;" for, if the house was "filled" with it, it was filled by the spirit being "*poured out*, or *shed forth*" upon them, and not by their being "*immersed in*" it. We wish not to protract the discussion, and therefore say no more at present.—*Ed. Ex.*

"SAINTS REIGN IN THE AIR."

In the Examiner of September, we gave a brief communication from Dr. Smith, of Hallowell, Me., on the above subject, which the reader is requested to look at again, page 142. We appended "a single

remark" by way of dissent in the following language:

"We do not see how the devil and his hosts, by going 'up on the *breadth of the* EARTH,' are to 'compass the *camp* of the saints about, and the beloved city,' which are '*in the* AIR;' nor how the saints are to 'REIGN with Christ a thousand years in the air' with nothing to reign over."

To this Br. Smith has replied at some length. We intended to insert his reply in the last Examiner, but it was crowded out; and, as we are hard pushed for room still, he will excuse us for giving only that part of his article which is a direct reply to our objections. Br. Smith, after enlarging on his previous article, and speaking of the wicked dead being raised out of *this* earth, (in opposition to the *new* earth, as Mr. Miller's theory maintains,) at the close of the Millennium, says:

The New Jerusalem is in the air, and in plain sight. This must be, else every eye could not see him, (Jesus) and they also which have pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth could not wail because of him. Also they are to see those that have come from the east, west, north, and south, in the kingdom with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and they themselves thrust out. Hence you see the saints must be in the air with Christ, and the whole host of the wicked must be raised from the dead in order to see their great loss, and know their final doom. Satan will now deceive them—then they compass the camp of the saints about. See Webster's Dictionary, where the sixth definition of the verb "*compass*" is, "to purpose—to intend—to imagine—to plot—to contrive," as we may say, to go about to perform in mind only. Thus you see, that to compass, is to plot, plan, contrive, imagine, &c. Thus they will do *while the saints are in the air*.

Paul says we are compassed about with such a cloud of witnesses. Hence, to compass about, denotes an array of evidence. Webster says, when this is the meaning, "it is in mind only." Thus it will be with this miserable company for the word says: "Fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them." The heavens and the earth which are now, are reserved for this very purpose. Peter tells us "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works therein shall be burnt up." This, I believe, as an honest man, will be the literal "lake of fire and brimstone," and will be the hell of the *Bible* into which "the wicked will be turned with all the nations that forget God." "The ungodly and the sinner will be *rewarded* in the earth;" Ps. 11: 31. And in this pool of liquid fire the devil and all wicked men and women will be "burnt up, root and branch," so that there will be no *wicked man, woman or devil* in the universe of God. See Psa. 37: 9, 10, 20; 34, 38; also, 104: 35; Prov. 2: 22, and 11: 31; Isaiah 1: 28, and a host of others.

But "we according to his promise look for a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." After the above scene of the resurrection of the saints, the melting of the earth, the destruction of the devil and the wicked passed upon John's mind, in vision, he says he saw the New-Jerusalem while it was *coming* down, and after it was down, and the glory connected with the seed of Abraham, and David's royal sons entering the Kingdom, under the whole heavens in which they will reign "for ever and ever," and not merely for a thousand years, as some suppose; that time will be then in the *past;* occupying the period while they reigned *with* Christ in the air.

Hence you see, the heavens will retain Jesus till the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the age began—till all things are subdued under him—his enemies destroyed and made his footstool, and he takes the kingdom under the whole heaven.

"Who will they reign over?" ANS.—the Bible does not say they will reign *over* any one; but, "they *lived* and reigned *with* Christ a thousand years."

I expect that when "the Lord shall take to himself his great power and shall reign," they will reign *with* him. After the saints were raised and were heard praising God in heaven, Rev. xix. 1, &c. they gave glory to God "for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth," verse 14th. We might infer that they reigned with him who was styled "the King of kings and Lord of lords." In the Psalms it is written that "the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning;" again, "he shall subdue the people under us and the nations under our feet." Paul says, "know ye not that the saints shall judge the world," (not decide the cases.) John says, "he that overcometh and keepeth my word unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron." From the above we believe that this reigning with Christ must be after his saints meet him in the air, and before he decends in the New Jerusalem with all his saints, to take possession of the redeemed earth which he purchased by his death and sufferings: see Eph. 1: 14.

May our Heavenly Father by his word, and the influences of the Holy Spirit, lead us all into the truth as it is in Jesus.

To "reign *with* Christ" is to reign *over* something. To talk of reigning with nothing in subjection is beyond our conception. The Queen of England and her Lords *reigning* without a subject would *seem* a contradiction. But Br. Smith has a right to his views; others must judge of their correctness.—*Ed. Ex.*

A CONTEMPLATED GREAT WORK ON THE MILLENNIUM.

THE AGE TO COME.—It is proposed to publish, if sufficient encouragement is offered, a work of 600 pages, entitled THE AGE TO COME.

It will present a full and entire History of all Theories touching the great question of the predicted MILLENNIUM, both Ancient and Modern. It will seek to show what is TRUE, and what is FALSE, in these Theories. This will constitute Part First of the Work. These are the leading Theories:

1. MILLENNARIAN THEORY.—Ancient View.
2. LIGHTFOOT'S THEORY.—Revived by Bush.
3. The FIFTH-MONARCHY THEORY.—An English Heresy.
4. MILLERISM.—History, Errors, Evils.
5. SOCIALISM.—Features, Claims, Bearings.

6. MILLENISM.—The Popular View.

PART SECOND of the Work will contain an Exhibit of the features of *The Age to Come*, as they appear presented in the Scriptures.

The book will be of the size, and general style, of Dowling's History of Romanism. It is intended to be a Work for the Age—a work for the Clergyman, the Theological Student, and the Common Christian.—PRICE TWO DOLLARS.

BY A CLERGYMAN,
Who has devoted much time to the subject.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, DEC., 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"The soul that sinneth it shall die."—Bible.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We have never supposed that we could give that variety in a *monthly* issue which could and would be given in a weekly paper. Our object has been *mainly* that of presenting the immortality question, and the topics naturally growing out of it; and, if the support would warrant it, and our friends desired it, gradually advance to a semi-monthly or weekly. But while we publish only monthly, and at the low price that we charge for the Examiner, we know our readers will be likely to be subscribers to some weekly paper which will afford them a variety on the *common* religious topics. We would gladly furnish them such matter did our limits admit. If our friends wish us to publish weekly, and devote one-half, or more, of the Examiner to general religious topics, and passing events, we will do so when fifteen hundred shall pledge themselves to send us two dollars each per year. A religious paper issued weekly ought to occupy all the time of, at least, one Editor so closely that he could scarcely be expected to be engaged in any other calling; and he must therefore look to the subscribers to sustain him in a pecuniary view. We are of opinion, however, that our present course is, on the whole, the best: that is, to let our readers look to those weekly papers they have been in the habit of sustaining, for general matters, and let us pursue those investigations to which, it seems to us, we have been specially called.

THE LAST NUMBER.—According to previous notice, this number is *the last* to all subscribers who do not embrace our "TERMS" of "*payment always in advance.*" We shall be very sorry to part with any who have been our patrons heretofore. A few have paid us nothing who have had the Examiner sent them from the commencement of the *New Series:* a few others have paid us nothing who have taken it from the commencement of the present volume: the number, however, in both cases, is small; and we now frankly forgive them all, and take our leave of them with none other than the kindest wishes for their present and eternal welfare. Those who have paid for the Examiner up to the present time, we hope have felt themselves benefited sufficiently to determine to continue. From all such, and as many more as are minded to become our patrons, we shall be glad to hear before our January issue. Unless we do hear from them, or find them *credited* beyond this number, we shall take it as an expression of their wish to *discontinue* the Examiner. It will be painful to blot out any name from our books; but, we wish not to send the Examiner to any who do not value it worth *fifty cents* per year, and we have no means of knowing that they do thus value it unless they send us that amount. We must treat all alike in this matter. Let none, then, think we slight them if we do not send them another number. The reason will be, we do not find them credited for 1849. If, however, any should not receive it who know they have sent us payment in advance, beyond the present number, if they will inform us when they sent, and how much, we shall take pleasure in sending the paper, even if we find that the money never reached us. In any *mistake*, of this kind, the information may be sent at *our expense*. We earnestly solicit all to continue their subscriptions, and send, at least, one *new* subscriber each. We will do the very best we can to make our paper interesting and instructive.

THE SERMON on "Profit and Loss," in this number of the Examiner, we hope, will not merely be read, but *studied*. We do not agree with every expression it contains, but we have received much "profit" from the study of it. We have read it some half dozen times since we received it, and shall not fail to read it again; and we must say, our interest in it increases the more we examine it. May the Lord make it a blessing to all who read it.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.—BY H. H. DOBNEY.—In the list of works sent us by Dr. Lees, Leeds, England, is that of the "*Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment*, by H. H. Dobney." This work we had heard of before we received Dr. Lees' communication, and had sent to England for it. It was the only one in his list we had any knowledge of prior to his favor.

The work of Dobney we have received, since the last Examiner was issued, and find it exceedingly interesting and instructive. It is a 12mo. of 278 pages, in "*two parts.*" The first part is divided into four chapters, in which the author takes up the Reasons for Discussing the Subject—the Relation God sustains to Man—the True idea of Sin—the Moral System—Excellency of Law—Propriety of Punishment—Punishment Inevitable—Punishment not Corrective, but Penal, &c. This occupies about seventy pages.

In the second part he takes up the question of the nature and character of the punishment; which is handled in a very kind and conciliatory spirit, but still in a manner that is calculated, all but irresistibly, to carry the mind to the conclusion that the popular notion is an error, and that the wicked will be "*miserably destroyed;*" and "be as though they had not been." This part of the subject is treated of in *eight* chapters of over 200 pages. We sincerely wish the whole book could be *reprinted*, and circulated over the United States. Had we the funds we would do it ourselves; but we have them not, and so fear we shall have to content ourself by giving portions of it in the Examiner. Reprinted it should sell for about seventy-five cents. The cost of the copy we have caused to be imported from London has been *one dollar and seventy cents.*

Dobney, we believe, is a Baptist minister, though no statement of his ecclesiastical relation is given in the book. Those who wish to see large extracts from the work will be gratified if they subscribe for the Examiner for 1849.

We will cause the work to be reprinted if one thousand copies are ordered within six months, and the money pledged to be forwarded when the work is ready for delivery; and to all who buy to sell again, 33 per cent discount will be made.

P. S.—Since writing the above, we have loaned the book to a friend, who, having read it, pledges to take *fifty dollars* in the stock necessary to republish it. The probable amount necessary to publish the first thousand copies will be $500. Any amount pledged shall be refunded in the books *at cost.*

PROSPECTUS.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY;

Or, Hymns, Psalms, and Songs, suitable to the worship of God and the proclamation of his truth.

By J. T. Walsh.

We propose publishing a cheap edition of Hymns, &c., free from the errors which obtain so extensively in every Hymn Book *extant.* The work will be suited to the *Christian worship*, and adapted to the faith of a people expecting the Messiah, and the establishment of his kingdom. In a word, it will *melodiously* set forth the views advocated in the *Bible Examiner and other periodicals devoted to the same objects.* The work will be published so soon as the author can do it with safety to himself. Any person feeling a disposition to aid in the enterprise, can do so by forwarding their contributions to Br. Storrs.

J. T. W.

It will be seen by the foregoing that Br. Walsh intends to furnish a "Hymn Book" such as many of us have felt is much needed. We rejoice that he has made up his mind to undertake it, and hope he may be abundantly sustained in that labor. If any of our friends have *good* hymns, suitable to such a work, will they favour the object by sending them to our office? And do not forget to let us know at once your wants in regard to such a hymn book, and what you will do to aid in its issue.

Bible Advocate.—The apology our brother of the Advocate has given us for the "tone of" his "reply" to our article on Zech. 14th is perfectly satisfactory. On our part we are glad to correct the "sad mistake" we made, in saying the present editor of that paper "had not copied an article from the Examiner." Our brother says:

"If you will turn to volume IV, number 8, page 62, you will find two articles selected from the Examiner, and duly credited. Also, same volume, number 15, first page, you will find a very lengthy article, duly credited: and we were thankful for the opportunity of making each and all these selections."

We are truly glad, brother, to receive this information; and by our "mistake" we did *you* injustice, for which we are sorry: we *thought* these articles were selected by Dr. Crary, in the absence of the editor: we are glad to find it otherwise, and trust you will forgive us the error.

We certainly "intended no wrong" in any of our remarks; but we did think there *seemed* to be an air of *positiveness* in the articles of our "*exchange*" which needed some reproof; we regret if we were not as "*courteous*" as the gospel requires in giving it, and will try to do better in future.

Examiner for 1848.—The volume is now completed. Any wishing to avail themselves of all the numbers, can have them at the subscription price, if they send their order and money soon. We are satisfied that new subscribers will regret it if they do not order the paper from January, 1848. Let all persons ordering the Examiner *write the names of persons and places plain;* for we have no means of "*guessing*" them out. For *terms* and *address* see first page.

LETTER FROM THOMAS SMITH.

Br. Storrs,—I am very much interested in the "Bible Examiner," especially in that part which so fearlessly and ably discusses the "Immortal Soul" question. It appears that men are beginning to think for themselves on the trans-Atlantic shores, as well as on our continent; and the result seems to be an abandonment of those long established notions that men have "immortal souls" naturally. I was struck recently with a little occurrence in the State of Massachusetts, while on board a packet. An intelligent *Sea Captain*, a fellow passenger, and a professor of religion, were on board, to whom I proposed the following question: "What, sir, do *you* suppose will be the *nature* of the punishment of the wicked in the future world." Said he, "Why, I suppose it will be a *horror of conscience*, or something of that kind." I then repeated numerous Scriptures by which to show him that the Bible taught they would be "cast into a lake of fire burning with brimstone," into a "furnace

of fire,"—that fire would "*devour* them—*burn them up,*" &c. Not knowing my faith, he very readily remarked, "Why, sir, if that be the nature of their punishment they will be annihilated, will they not?" I then gave him some Bible testimony, and the result was that he acknowledged that their *destruction* was the most Scriptural and reasonable. To this conclusion, it appears to me, men must come, in order to admit a harmony in the attributes of the *Father of mercies.* Numbers of strong minded men of my acquaintance, are merging, and have merged into universalism, because of the so-called orthodox creed of *eternal life in misery;* and they will increase more and more unless the true light upon this important subject is brought to bear upon their minds, and then I trust, if they are candid, they will readily exchange their error for the truth.

I cannot, for myself, see either reason or Scripture in your ideas of probation after the coming of Jesus. In fact, if such a thing should be,—and men are of the same natures as they are now, and the claims of Jehovah the same—I cannot see that but very few, if any, would be benefitted by it; and should the Lord in any way afford them a superior opportunity to what men now have, He would in that case show *himself* a respecter of persons—which idea the Scriptures contradict.

Still praying to be led into all truth, I am your brother in tribulation, hoping for eternal life at the appearance and kingdom of Jesus Christ the Son of God.

DOWN EAST, September, 1848.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

We are not offended that Br. Smith cannot "see either reason or scripture in our ideas of Probation after the coming of Jesus." Our old prejudices do not give way at once. Will Br. Smith admit, that we, in this age, or last 50 years, have had "any means afforded" us "superior to what men" had in the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries, when it was death to read the Scriptures in the language of the common people? If he does admit this—Is God therefore a respecter of persons? The "respect of persons" the Scriptures speak of, as not in God, is always spoken of his character in relation to *the account* he will call men to for the improvement or misimprovement of means granted them, whether Jews, Christians, or Gentiles. That some have had, in all ages, and in different ages, more means and advantages to know God and bear fruit, is undeniable. The one, two, and five talents clearly teach this doctrine. Did not Abraham have a "superior opportunity to what" many had, both before him and in the age in which he lived? Did not the posterity of Jacob have superior advantages for centuries? Paul says they had "much every way—chiefly because unto them was committed the oracles of God;" Rom. 3: 2. Do not we enjoy, under the gospel, "superior advantages" to what the Jews did in their best days? And may not the next age confer still greater advantages without an impeachment of God's dealings with men? Is our "eye evil because" God is "good?" May He "not do what He will with his own?" May He not give to some "superior advantages" to that of others, and yet not be a "respecter of persons" in the Scripture sense? Facts show that He has thus distinguished men in all ages. But in *judgment* he is no respecter of persons: greater privileges lay us under superior obligations; and if we fail, the greater will be our condemnation. *We* can "see neither reason nor scripture in" the *objections* made to the idea of probation, to some, after the advent; but we do not condemn others, who think differently, so long as they manifest an honest desire to know what truth is.

BR. ELON EVERTS, Vergennes, Vt., writes:—

BR. STORRS:—I find once and awhile one who dares read the Examiner, and after trying its "heresy" by the balances of the sanctuary of truth, they find (although widely different from the popular theology of the age,) that it agrees so well with the sealed weights, that they want more of it. Many are inclined to cast their old weights (heathen traditions, endorsed by the creed making sectarian, honoured and endorsed however much,) "to the moles and bats." I send enclosed three dollars to be appropriated for the Examiner.

I am glad to see that you propose to speak occasionally on the reign of David's rightful heir and his kingdom. Will it not be profitable to say something on the unfulfilled promises, made by God to a people that suffered over 400 years in Egyptian bondage, and brought out with a high hand, and placed in a goodly land, and had wholesome laws, but they broke them, and then were carried away captive into all nations, their city destroyed, and their land made desolate and trod down by the Gentiles? All this has taken place literally, to a literal Israel, and upon a literal land and city. And God that has done this just precisely and literally, according to his threatening, previously made, for their iniquity; also has, by many of his prophets, declared, as by Ezk. 39: 26–28, "Now will I bring *again* the captivity of *Jacob*, and have mercy on the *whole house* of *Israel*, and will be jealous of my holy name; AFTER that they have borne their shame, and all their trespasses whereby they have trespassed against me, when they dwelt safely in their land, and none made them afraid. When I have brought them again from the people, and gathered them out of their enemies' land, and am sanctified in them in the sight of many nations: Then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them any more there." This all to be about the time of the great slaughter of the wicked, and supper for the fowls and beasts, as shown in said chapter; being parallel with Mal. 4, and Rev. 19. Not parallel with the slaughter of Rev. 20th, and Ezk. 38th. Now this gathering of Israel can't be fulfilled upon a spiritual Israel.

DR. N. SMITH, Hallowell, Me., writes:—

BR. STORRS,—We have some reformation in this place: several have been converted and others reclaimed, so as about to double our numbers. We are all of one mind: all say the same thing: all consider your paper good; and if it were not for your Millennium on the earth—probation after Christ comes, and the return of the Jews, it would be the best paper printed. If you have the truth on these points, may the good Lord enable you to make it so plain that we may see it by your bringing the plain testimony and not merely inference. But if we have the truth, may you see it and embrace it in the love of it.

Communicated for the Bible Examiner.

PROFIT AND LOSS—A LAY SERMON.

By Frederic R. Lees,

Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Giessen, F.S.A., Edin. Editor of 'The Truth Seeker,' etc.

Preached at Leeds, England, A. D. 1845.

'Godlikeness profiteth for all things.'—Paul.

'What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose his soul?'—The Christ.

'For a recompense—be ye enlarged.'—Paul.

The principle of Profit and Loss, as embodied in the startling question of the Great Teacher, contains at once the seed, the sum, and the substance of that divine gospel, which it was the mission of the Messiah to declare and develope.

Tho' a problem in heavenly arithmetic lying at the basis of all Life, He was the first to give it a full and living solution; to exemplify the *ideal* principles of his sacred Ethics in real and vital being. In *words*, indeed, he has broadly and beautifully shadowed out the interior principles of his Father's government, but in *works* he has declared them with a depth and distinctness which none can mistake. From the first and fearless utterances of the Spirit, which ensured the hate and persecution of the Priesthood, to the hour of his crucifixion on Calvary, when the false triumph of his foes opened wide to him the Gates of Glory, his life was one long and illustrious commentary on the principle expressed by his Apostle—'Whatsoever a man sows, even this shall he reap; therefore the sower to his *flesh*, shall of the flesh reap *corruption*, while the sower to the *spirit* shall of the spirit reap *life* everlasting.*

THE GRAND LIFE-PROBLEM.†

Man, spiritually, was appointed in the divine image—in other words, he was both designed and adapted to become an ORGAN OF LIFE AND OF GOD. His nature is two-fold—*animal* and *spiritual*, of which, in the order of development, individually and historically, the animal is first—the spiritual second. 'The first Adam,' is therefore, 'of the earth earthy;' it eats dust until spiritualized and purified—it tends to the nothingness of self; therefore he who regards the selfhood of the flesh as his vital centre, must reap corruption. But 'the second Adam,' the fleshly organ of life purified and 'made *perfect*' thro' trials, temptations, and sufferings—in short, the incarnate Word or Wisdom, EMMANUEL or 'God with *us*'—is the 'Lord from Heaven'—the divine humanity—MAN, 'the temple of God.'

Thus man, tho' *liable*, by the mal-administration of his faculties, to sink into corruption and nihility, is also *capable* of rising into the similitude of the Messiah—'GOD manifest in the *flesh*'—and of inheriting the eternal glories. This is no longer an ideal theory—a vain speculation—for 'the Lord of us, Jesus Christ, gave himself for our sins, *that he might deliver us from the tendency of a malignant spirit*, according to the will of God.'‡ 'I do say, therefore, walk in *spirit*, and you shall not perfect a desire of the *flesh*. The flesh certainly wars against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh.'‖ 'But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, forbearance, usefulness, goodness, truth, gentleness, temperance; against such there is no law [of death]. They, in short, who belong to the Christ, have-crucified-and-still-crucify the flesh, with the propensities and selfish dispositions. If we are *alive* in spirit, we may also perform the rites-and-ceremonies in spirit.§ These things are not ideal impossibilities, for they *have been* realized, and may be for evermore. Christ, our Lord and leader, has been in the wilderness before us; he has conquered the demon principles, and triumphed over our real enemies—those of our own household. As our 'elder brother' and 'exemplar,' and 'the captain of our salvation,' he has actually *achieved* such perfection thro' sorrow, conflict, and suffering, and is even now gone before us to point and prepare the way; He, our Precursor and our Pledge, has risen from the Dead, physically and spiritually, that *we* may rise also! For, as Paul declares, 'If the spirit of the Raiser of the Saviour from the dead, dwells in *you*, the Raiser of the Anointed from the dead, will make *even your* mortal bodies live. If you live fleshly you shall die; but if you put to death in the spirit, the doings of the body, you shall make yourselves live. If indeed sons, also heirs, heirs verily of God, *fellow heirs* indeed of the Messiah; if we are fellow sufferers, it is our duty to be also fellow glorified.'* Thus all is prepared for the establishment of that 'kingdom of God'—which 'cometh not with observation; for, behold! the kingdom of God'—with all its life-laws and everlasting principles—'is within you.' Here Doubt and Despair are expelled by the demonstration of a Divine Life, while Truth, and Hope, and Love, abide for ever.

This then is the grand life-problem—the purpose of our being at all, and which therefore, unattained, we shall cease to be—to subordinate and sanctify the sensual, and to develope and display the spiritual, principles of Human Nature. Wot ye not, brethren, that we should be about our Father's business? That if we rise not with the Heavenly, we must inevitably Sink with the Earthly, Man? Unvivified by the divine spirit—who *only* hath immortality—we must die. 'Dust we are, and unto dust must we return.' We have, then, the *Divine* Nature to *inspire* and *image* in the *Human*—and wo be to us if we fulfil not this life function, and 'purify ourselves even as HE is pure.' The consequences of failure are not arbitrary but inevitable, and no false faith or corrupt creed can arrest their course, or avert their consummation. 'The soul that sinneth, *it* shall die. God will *by no means* clear the guilty. As the tree *falleth* so it *lieth*'—as death leaves us will judgement find us. Hence the exhortation of Paul—'Let each, therefore, examine his own mechanism, and then he shall have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another. *For each shall bear his own burthen.* Let him, however, who is under instruction in THE LOGOS,' (or eternal light which enlightens every man in all times), 'associate with him who is instructing in all good things. *Deceive not yourselves*'—by thinking to escape the retribution of your own acts; 'God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man sows *even this* shall he reap.'†

PROGRESSIVE CULTURE.

Religion, then consists in the progressive Culture of the Soul for the developement of the Divine—and this culture must be based on fixed laws, and conducted on firm and eternal principles. Religion is 'a fountain of living waters springing up unto everlasting life'—but those waters must gush and flow forth according to some stated and certain laws. Now, it is the function of the religious philosopher to ascertain and expound these laws of the Life-kingdom. If we divide that kingdom into three Departments—the Instinctive, the Intellectual, and the Moral—then the mission of religion is to put down the rebellion of the lower against the higher Provinces, to restore the rule and government of Israel, and effect a complete reconciliation amongst the conflicting Powers. In fine, its aim is the re-union of the human with the divine nature—'Christ in us'—a renewing and indwelling spirit—'the hope of glory.'

Christ's ethical problem of Profit and Loss, depends

*Here, and elsewhere, we shall translate the Greek as literally as possible. Man has veiled the re-veil-ation of the Gospel, by covering it with his own pre-judgements.

†The Head Lines were inserted by us.—ED. EX.

‡Gal. i. 4.

‖Gal. v. 16.

§Gal. v. 22, &c. *Stoichomen*, rites and ceremonies—its full force.

*Rom. viii. 11-17. † Gal. vi. 4-7.

for its solution upon the law of Life and Death—or in other words, upon the law which regulates *Pro*gression and *Retro*gression, known in ordinary phrase as Reward and Punishment. We have chosen, however, to discuss this most important of all Institutions, under a new denomination.

Firstly, because the old terminology is confused and inadequate. 'Reward' is not, either in actual usage, or according to its etymology, the logical antithesis of punishment, since it denotes either the return of good or the return of evil. 'Punishment' is also ambiguous and indefinite. It signifies, according to the savageness or civilization of the people who employ it, any suffering or privation from the most trifling penalty to the most terrible visitation of vindictive torment—anything from the irrevocable punishment of death, down to the slightest chastisement or smallest privation inflicted with the merciful intent of warning or reclamation. In itself it sometimes denotes mere privation or loss—privation of means, loss of liberty, faculty, or life—while it may connote in the mind of the magistrate or parent, the purest or most merciful emotions. At other times it may denote torment the most intense, while it connotes, in the mind of the inflictor, feelings of the fiercest rage and vengeance.*

Secondly, therefore, we avoid the ancient terminology, because we wish to discriminate the pure and essential elements of this institute of Reward and Retribution, from its mere accidents and accompaniments.

Thirdly, to exclude from the consideration of *Divine* punishments, which are the results of wisdom and love, the remotest idea of vindictive feeling or of vain torment—ideas, alas! but too commonly associated with the subject, and which (as we *can* truly worship only what we love) tend to darken the Divine Aspect, and to destroy our deepest feelings of reverence towards God. Indeed we think with Lord Bacon, that it is better to have no opinion of God at all, than one which is dishonoring to Him and degrading to us. And all misconceptions of Deity are degrading. As is the God we have framed to ourself, so will be our Life and Soul: an image of a gloomy and partial deity fills the spirit with kindred gloom and fitfulness, while, conversely, a morose and jealous temper will reflect an image of God corresponding to itself.

> Thus the 'moon-struck Sophist stood,
> Watching the shade from his own soul upthrown
> Fill heaven and darken Earth, and in such mood
> *The Form he saw and worshipt was his own*,
> His likeness in the world's vast mirror shown;
> And 'twere an innocent dream, but that a faith
> *Nurst by fear's dew of poison*, grows thereon.'

Indeed, there is far too much cause for the poet's complaint. The lovely truths of Christianity are hidden by the clouds of darkness which continually ascend from the abyssmal regions of man-made Theology, and the holy and happy heaven of the Great *Good* is transformed into Tartarus—

> 'Hate is throned on high, with Fear her mother,
> Above the highest.'

Verily, those perverters of Christianity are guilty of half the Infidelity of the world.

CRITERION OF THE MORAL AND SPIRITUAL CHARACTER OF AN AGE.

The GOD-THOUHT of any age is an unerring criterion of its moral and spiritual character. For this reason is the Christ divine; he *must* have come from the bosom of the Father, else he could not have revealed Him. His sublime life-definition of the eternal and the invisible—'GOD IS LOVE'—the most comprehensive generalization philosophy has ever reached, and expressing at once the end and aim of the immeasurable universe, far transcends in its power of spiritual demonstration, the literal logic of the schools, and in itself vindicates the claim of Christianity to be considered the highest and most perfect form of ethical philosophy—the Philosophy of Benevolence. It penetrates at once the secret of the universe—it reveals *the law of life and felicity*. God is love; but all nature, *our* nature is constructed by Him. It is, therefore, a mechanism of Love, designed to move and be moved by that principle. He, then, as St. John says, who abides in love, abides in God. He is in *harmony* with himself, with God, and with the world. He is happy.

> Hence 'vainly seek
> The selfish for that happiness denied
> To aught but virtue! Blind and hardened, they
> Who hope for peace amid the storms of care,
> Who covet power they know not how to use,
> And sigh for pleasure they refuse to give,
> Madly they frustrate still their own designs;
> And, where they hope that quiet to enjoy
> Which virtue pictures, bitterness of soul,
> Pining regrets, and vain repentances,
> Disease, disgust, and lassitude, pervade
> Their valueless and miserable lives.'

This is the grand lesson of life. Let us hope it is becoming better understood, and that the Poet is a true Prophet.

> 'Hoary-headed selfishness has felt
> Its death-blow, and is tottering to the grave;
> A brighter morn awaits the human day,
> When every transfer of earth's natural gifts
> Shall be a commerce of good words and works;
> When poverty and wealth, the thirst of fame,
> The fear of infamy, disease and woe,
> War with its million horrors, and fierce hell,
> Shall live but in the memory of time,
> Who, like a penitent libertine, shall start,
> Look back, and shudder at his younger years.'

We have only to expand John's definition a little, in order to arrive at the most important of all our religious sentiments—the distinct, steady, and constantly operative conception of what is implied in the words, 'Almighty and Omnipresent God.' Of a truth, God is Love, and Love is God. This idea of Deity alike excludes from our conceptions, vindictive and purposeless visitations of pain. Pain itself, in this view, assumes a divine appearance—becomes an aspect and apparition of love. Even what has been figuratively called 'the frown of God,' is to be traced to the same source: it is an eclipse of the Divine Countenance arising from some passing cloud of Sense, and the pain and darkness which we feel is designed to *warn* us of some transgression of the divine laws by which the radiance of the spiritual sun would become more completely intercepted. Pain is intended to bring *repentance*—i. e. to notify us that we have strayed out of the straight path, that we may *turn back*. This is the doctrine of Paul. 'O man!' says he, 'Dost thou consider the riches of His goodness and forbearance, and long-suffering, foolishness?—ignorant, as thou art, that the *goodness* of God leads thee to repentance? In *proportion*, however to thy *hardness* and *impenitent* heart, thou dost treasure up to thyself wrath in the day of wrath, and the uncovering of the just retribution of God, who will render to each *according to his doings*.'* Pain, here, is referred to the 'goodness of God'—and happy may he be deemed, who preserves unimpaired the *moral sensitiveness* which informs him of the impending evil! On the contrary, the *loss of feeling*, which indicates the real punishment of sin the *seared* conscience, the *hard* heart—these proclaim the death of the spirit, the ruin and destruction of the temple itself! These, then, are the only things the heroic Christian need fear; not trials, afflictions or persecutions.

> 'The clouds we so much dread,
> Are big with mercy, and shall break
> In blessings on our head.'

*Denote, from *notaire*, to mark—applies to a single idea; connote from *con*notare, to mark *along with*—means to note *one* thing in *addition* to another.

*Rom. ii. 3, &c.

Without the ideas of Wisdom and Goodness—and their correlative punishment apart from passion—there can be no real Religion, for there can be no respect and no love. Priestianity there may be, but not Christianity; a contrivance of priests for priestly purposes, but not an inspiration from heaven. God dwelleth not with lies. When the people give up their souls to the keeping of others, to do whatsoever the priests prescribe to them, they may have Superstition enough, but no true Piety; they depart from the ever-present God to lean upon Man; they doubt the goodness of Deity, and therefore hire a man to entreat Him!

As the conception of an Omnipresent and Almighty Being of Love and Wisdom, is the essence of Religion, and the sole source of *all* the good impressions it is capable of producing, it follows, that every idea instilled into us, implying *imperfection* in Deity, is a perversion of religion,—a debasement of the purifying ideal we aim at—which, so far as it goes, transforms our spiritual food into poison, the good into evil. It is evident, then, that just in proportion as men set up for the object of their imitation or worship a being of *limited* wisdom and goodness, do they manufacture for themselves a motive for the practice of what is contrary to *perfect* wisdom and goodness. Let us beware, therefore, in discussing divine punishments, that we do not permit ourselves to think ill of God by associating the notion of punishment with those vindictive feelings which so often tarnish the judicial proceedings of earthly courts. There is still, to some extent, a language current on this question which we hold in the utmost abhorrence. It is the relics of a barbarous age, when the human and the Divine natures were equally misunderstood.

Men who themselves, in earthly matters, would never think of pain, save as an undesirable means to a desirable end, and therefore to be inflicted to the smallest possible extent required for reformation, will yet, from the mere force of phrase, ascribe to the Deity the infliction of torment in the most cruel excess; and even represent the un-proud God as administering pain, not like a wise and virtuous being under the direction of benevolence and with a view of correction, but in the spirit of personal revenge, to 'satisfy,' as the cant runs, '*Offended Justice*'—an abstraction made for the occasion—and to '*vindicate his outraged dignity!*' Now this is simply to speak evil of God, i. e. to blaspheme; it is one of those misrepresentations of the Divine procedure which have reacted in the production of our prevalent Infidelity—the ascription to God, not of the character even of an amiable man, but of a vain and vengeful savage.*

No wonder that such representations should be useless and inefficient in *re*forming character, however profitable in creating a demand for the vicarious services and ceremonies of Priests. Even the abstract representation of Justice, in the Law, could only 'condemn wickedness in the flesh'—it could not conquer and regenerate the flesh. 'For if a law, capable of creating life, had been given, justice would most assuredly have been by the law.'—'Hence the law has become itself our schoolmaster for Christ, since we should be justified by the truth. The TRUTH, however, having come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For you are all sons of God, thro' the truth in Christ Jesus.'† Thus we see that men's hearts are to be touched and transformed, not even by the Law, much less by pictures of a partial and fear-inspiring Deity—but by the magic influence of Love, exhibited in harmony with the highest forms of Philosophy and Truth. The incarnation of the Eternal REASON (*logos*) of God, whose 'Life was the light of Men,' alone can revive and regenerate the race. 'It existed in the world, and the world made itself thro' It, and the world did not know It.'—'As many, however, as *received Him*, He gave to them an existence to make themselves Sons of God, to those that have truth in his DIVINITY,‡ who were born, not of bloods, nor of a will of flesh, nor of a will of man, but of God.'—Truly says John: 'Of his fullness we all have received, and grace for grace; *because* the Law was given by Moses'—the Law which could not save, because it gave no true insight into the nature of God; therefore, 'Grace and Truth came thro' Jesus Christ.'‡ Thus, we perceive, that the ordinary representations of Divine-punishment, virtually blot out the revelations of the Messiah-Redeemer, and exhibit a view of Deity which neither *in*forms nor *re*forms.

FURTHER DEFECTIVE VIEWS OF THEOLOGY.

But the common doctrine of Divines is exceedingly defective on another ground. They equally mistake the nature and administration of punishment. Not only do they render it arbitrary, dependent on mere will, and disconnected with the principles and processes of God's perpetual Government, but they also *postpone* it to an undefined and distant period. One might have thought that legislative experience, and the progress of mental philosophy, would long since have excited the suspicion of serious error in the *pseudo* 'orthodox' views on this subject; but, alas! for the influence of creed, experience and philosophy are not permitted to aid in the developement of sectarian 'divinity.' *Its* dogmas are all stereotyped—and its prophets all infallible! The sects, little and big, have all some 'Pope' or other, or some final 'council' or 'creed,' to act as an extinguisher upon reason and evidence. If there *be* any essential difference between Roman 'orthodoxy' of one sort, and British 'orthodoxy' of all sorts, it is only that slight one remarked by Steele—namely, that the Roman Pontiff is always in the right, and the Protestant Parson never in the wrong! The Roman Pope is un-*fail*-able—the Protestant Bigot un-*err*-able.

Whether we regard punishment, for the present, as consisting in pain, or in privation, what, we ask, are those principles of its administration which political experience has now rendered indisputable? Firstly, that the CERTAINTY, and, secondly, that the PROXIMITY of punishment, is necessary to its efficiency.

But Theologists weaken the belief in the *certainty* of punishment, by opening out vicarious sources of escape from the consequences of sin, and thus make the actual infliction a doubtful matter. True—Prophets and Apostles have warned us against this pernicious doctrine, and taught us that the consequences of Sin cannot be counteracted—but where 'divines' fail to pervert prophets and apostles, they contrive very conveniently to forget them. Nevertheless, reader 'Be not deceived! Whatsoever a man soweth, even *this* shall he reap.' 'The soul that sinneth, *it* shall die.' Paul in his exordium to the Romans, inculcates this doctrine expressly. They who *de*-formed themselves, *did* reap corruption. 'God delivered them over to the very desires of their hearts, *receiving in themselves the retribution for their wickedness which was needful*—seeing that they did not feel

*These Theologists may not consciously believe or really mean what they say. A verbal faith is mere talk, unmeaning rote, not true belief. Belief signifies to cleave together, being a softened form of the Teutonic *Ghe-laub*; of which cliff, cleave, club, and glove, are hardened forms. Thus, to 'believe with the heart unto righteousness,' is to cleave to it, to desire, love, lief, or chose it. Intellectual belief also implies a cleaving—it consists of propositions perceived to be in rational union. But there is no consistency between the vulgar notions of future punishment, and a proper conception of Divine Love and Wisdom. To think about them is to discard them. 'Strictly speaking,' says Bishop Berkeley 'to believe that which has no meaning in it, is impossible. Men impose upon themselves, by imagining that they believe those propositions which they have often heard, tho' at bottom they have no meaning in them.' (Principles of Human Knowledge, S. 54.)

†Gal. iii. 21–27.

‡*To onoma*, '*Name*;' i. e. the sacred 'JA'—'I am.' St. John adds—'And the Word made itself a flesh, and dwelt in us, and we have beheld ourselves its glory, a glory as of an only-begotten from [the] Father, full of Grace and Truth. i. 14.

‡John i. 10–13.

disposed to practice the Good according to knowledge, God delivered them over to the *unfeeling* mind, to do things which are not *harmonious*.'*

Emerson, in his admirable essay on 'Compensation,' enforces the same truth. '*Crime and punishment grow out of one stem.* Punishment is a fruit that, unsuspected, ripens within the flower of the pleasure which concealed it.' 'The dice of God,' said an old Grecian, 'are always loaded.' True, every law has its sanction, every act its effect. There is no *chance*—and therefore no evasion of consequences—in the universe of God.

Again: the 'popular preachers' represent punishment not only as dubious, but as DISTANT. It is not viewed as an *effect* certainly and necessarily following transgression as its *cause*, but as a mere arbitrary accident, which may or may not ensue; just as the sinner succeeds or fails in propitiating his judge. But the stern fact is, that a miracle alone could effect the severance of Crime from its true Punishment—and that miracle will never be wrought. Nevertheless, the ideal postponement of the penalty of crime to a dim and distant future, deprives the fear of its due force, and renders the conception of the consequences faint and ineffective. Now, as it is the grand law of Love to conserve as much as may be the Being it has created; and therefore to be as sparing as possible in the employment of pain, the work and warning of its decay—in other words, to inflict the smallest amount which will serve the purpose—it follows, that benevolence will be ever seeking to connect the conception of crime *as closely as possible* with that of punishment, in order to render the smallest pain, in degree and duration, sufficient. And this conclusion will be found to harmonize with facts. If the first painful intimation of organic or moral disorder and decay, be not heeded—and, as a rule, the *first* is the most acute—the voice of the warner grows weaker not stronger, *in relation to the same act and injury*—the susceptibilty less and less—until, finally, body and mind become *unfeeling*, dead. Pain, we see here, is the protest of Vitality against whatever will violate its integrity, and, of necessity, as repeated transgressions subtract from the sum of its energies, its protests become more few and feeble, until they finally terminate in mortification or death. Thus step by step, the *pain* diminishes, while the *loss*—the true punishment and lasting consequence—increases. But the vulgar and anti-scriptual notions of future punishment are the very reverse of all this: for they represent the *pain*, and therefore the *faculty* of feeling—the life—as gradually augmenting! Pain, here, *ceases* when it can answer no purpose, and 'corruption' follows. But there, it is attached to disorder, without decay!—to life, without hope of amendment!! to being, without aim or use!!! This is not only absurd: it is

'Horrible! most Horrible!'

What, too, ought to be thought of the wisdom of any human legislator, who should decree that the pains and penalties of murder should be *postponed* till twenty or thirty years after the perpetration of the crime?—thus violating the second condition of efficient punishment—the nearness of the penalty to the crime. Or what should we think of his attempt to mend the matter, by ordaining, in opposition to all the analogy of nature, that the lapsed interval of ease should be *then* made up by the infliction of intenser torment in his '*prison-house*'—where he could do neither good nor ill? Yet such is the atrocious government which many Theologists have daringly imputed to 'the blessed God!' Is it not, in fact and in substance, the theory of all who set forth the pains of the *future*-life as intended for the prevention of vice in *this*?

But in truth, O brothers, this vile and cruel theory is not drawn from the pure well of Scripture undefiled: but, as might be anticipated, *a priori*, it is a fiction and forgery of priests.

*Rom. i. 24-28.

IMPORTANT PRINCIPLES AND RESULTS.

God's laws are not marked by startling and sudden transitions—all is gradual and progressive. We entirely accord in the opinion of Bishop Butler, founded on analogy, that we have no reason to suppose that the change from the present to the future life, will be greater than the change from the condition which precedes birth to that state into which it ushers us. In fact, we believe that the individual's revived or resurrection-consciousness, will exactly *represent* the consequences of past *action*, neither less nor more; and therefore that he will be found in possession of all the dispositions and habits formed by his previous career—either adapted for *progress* in the Divine life, or fitted for *destruction*. In short, we believe again with St. Paul, that 'whatsoever a man sows, *even this* shall he reap: Therefore he who sows to *the flesh* shall of the flesh reap *corruption*, and he who sows to *the spirit* shall of the spirit reap *life everlasting*.' In other words, if we depend on our own defectibility, or on our fellow worm, equally defectible—we shall err and perish. But if we cherish the Divine Logos—'the light that enlightens every man coming into the world'—the *Divine* Spirit manifested in *our Spirits*—we shall depend upon His perfection, and partaking of it, we shall *live*.

The Rewards of heaven are unlike those of this world, which, in strictness, are equivalents and exchanges only. Heaven's rewards are properly matters of *profit*—of increase, produce, growth. 'The fruit of righteousness—is a tree of life.' You have not to *give* in order to *get*, but to *do* only, to work. Action secures addition; and you have simply to *use* your capital, and it is straightway increased, sixty or a hundred fold. We live under a dispensation of Grace, which excludes merit but grants reward.* Reward is God's Royal Rule of dispensing grace; he who uses the one favor, shall have more *added* to it, while from him that uses it not, shall be taken away even what he hath. Walk a little, and you shall be *able* to walk more; work a little, and you shall have *strength* to work more; think a little, and you will have *power* to think more; love a little, and, bye and bye, you will love more *largely*. The universe is one grand system of USES. All our powers are given for enlargement by the *means* of use. All faculties and forms are summed up in Life, in *Being*: but this *being* differs in degree and developement in every individual. Viewed as the first gift—as the ground and cause of enjoyment and action, and as capable of indefinite developement—this CAPACITY of becoming useful and happy in an endless life, the SOUL and *substratum* of existence, assumes a value which transcends all worlds. What indeed, shall a man give in exchange for *this soul*? This life, this soul, however, is but *lent*. The awful judgement-question will be—'What hast thou done with thy soul?' It is designed for culture and developement, and if not developed, it must deteriorate, decay, and die.

Christ preached this universal doctrine to his disciples: self-developement was the reward held out. 'Verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, *who shall not receive many-fold more in this present time*, and in the world to come, life everlasting.' Thus, as nothing can arrest the consequences of evil, so nothing can frustrate the rewards of the good. The reason is obvious; the true rewards are *internal* and *spiritual*, consisting of a continual extension of the spirit's *capacities*; the kingdom is spiritual—it cometh not with observation, 'FOR BEHOLD! THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS WITHIN YOU'—and therefore its treasures are incorruptible, and beyond the reach of

*'The *wages* of Sin is death, but the *gift* of God is eternal life.'

rust or robber. Thus has God placed man's happiness in his own keeping, and enabled him, by the humble submission of his spirit to the influences of the Divine, to 'lay hold of eternal life'—to grasp the glories, and realize the rich rewards, of the spiritual realms.

As 'Reward' signifies, in its essential use, positive *possession—increase* of faculty, capacity, or means—in short, ACCESSION OF LIFE; so 'Punishment,' as its logical antithesis or negation, denotes *loss* of faculty or means—or, in brief DECESSION, DECAY, DEATH.

An obvious inference from these definitions is, that *pleasure*, as pleasure, is no more the real and abiding Reward, than *pain*, as pain, is true and permanent Punishment. That pleasure is no further 'reward' than as it *indicates* right action, will perhaps be admitted by considering, that the act of Sin is *frequently* productive of intense *temporary* pleasure. But can we say that sin is 'rewarded?' At least, its performer is not *profited*; reversely, he *loses* some portion of the power for re-experiencing lawful pleasure; the premature bloom is followed by premature blight. All pleasure out of time, or out of place, is inevitable *loss*—not loss of present pleasure, perhaps, but loss of *faculty* for further excitement—loss of the GROUNDWORK of pleasure and pain. This is as much worse than the other, as the loss of a fruitful tree is worse than the loss of its year's fruitage. In trade, the loss of Capital must be the capital-loss: in Life, the loss of *power*, of soul, or capacity, the 'capital punishment.'

These views of Reward and Punishment will be found pregnant with many important consequences. They not only tear off the dark and vengeful mask with which a vile and daring anthropomorphism has concealed the radiant countenance of the everlasting 'Father of Lights,' but point to *pain* itself as supplying as true a demonstration of Divine benevolence as the most exquisite felicity. The sum is this:—

All the movements and mechanism of the universe are manifestations of Wisdom and Grace, for 'God is love.' Pleasure and pain are but varied *indications* of His will—the two pointers on the Dial of Life, marking respectively, the steady or oscillating movements of the vital machinery. The Divine Physiologist designs to teach us by means of pleasure, *if we will*, that 'His ways are ways of pleasantness, and all his paths are peace:'—but if, like stubborn, ignorant children, we *will not* be taught this lesson of wisdom, He adopts the other method of instruction, and, by means of pain, he demonstrates that 'the ways of transgressors are hard.' Thus pleasure and pain are but the radiant outflowings of one Divine Aspect, reflected on different paths, and assuming diverse appearances. In 'the path of Holiness' the Divine lustre descends in the form of 'the Dove,' bringing to the heart perpetual peace and joy;—in the 'way of Death' it gathers into the apparition of 'a burning Bush,' symbolically signifying that sin is 'a consuming fire' the end whereof is death. But behind and beneath all, there is Love. Pain is not the real loss, the true Punishment, but merely the *indicator* of injury—the warning voice of God in nature, raised when we stray into the path of danger and death, that we may hear, turn back, and live. It for ever repeats the touching question of the Lord—'Why will ye die?' 'As I live, saith Jehovah, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked.'

These are our views of the great life-problem of Profit and Loss; and, we think, such a consideration of God's all-wise and almighty government, by refining and exalting our conceptions of the Divine character and requirements, by rendering our ideas of responsibility at once more rational and more rigid, and by showing us that we must inevitably reap the reward of our own works or eat of the bitter fruit of our own doings, cannot possibly fail to deepen all those salutary convictions which tend to wise and worthy conduct; to give force and fixedness to the kindliest affections of our nature; and to strengthen and stimulate the desire of doing good, by exhibiting virtuous action as the parent of power for ever enlarging in the might and majesty of its conquences.

Such views, also, would put men on their guard against the misleading and baser affections; would explain, not only how much is *gained* by progression in virtue, but how much is *lost* by giving way to selfish and sensuous seductions.

We should learn ourselves, and teach our children, to *always associate crime with punishment, and virtue with reward*, thereby inducing an instinctive avoidance of the one, and a spontaneous performance of the other. Even Selfishness itself would at last discover its best interests to consist in having its propensities supplanted by those higher faculties which lead us to rejoice in being the instrument of another's felicity: and, finally, on closing the Ledger of Human Life, we should find a vast balance of Profit standing to our credit, consisting in enlarged capacities of Being and of Action, in augmented faculties of enjoyment and of use, ready to be transferred to our account and favor in God's 'Book of Life.'

Solemn, indeed, is the question which returns to us; 'What is a man *profited*, if he gain the whole world and *lose* his own soul?'

BUSINESS NOTICES.—Wm. Algire, the money sent in October was not received; but we have sent you the sermons since yours of November 6th.

C. B. Hotchkiss. Yours on "Symbols" shall have a place soon.

Thomas Smith. We sent you 20 copies of Six Sermons, quarto, to North Truro, Mass., the fore part of October; we sent, to the same place, 17th of November, 12 copies of the 18mo.

Adam Dixon. We have none of the "Tracts" except what are bound up with the Six Sermons. How shall we apply the money intended for them?

To all persons. The fact that you receive from us what you send for, is evidence your money is received.

THE "THREE OFFERS" AGAIN.—1. Any person sending us $1, current money, free of expense, shall have the Bible Examiner for 1849, and seven copies of the "Six Sermons," 18mo., and our views of the State of the Dead, including the tract "Rich man and Lazarus," with each copy of the Sermons; or 20 copies of the quarto edition, which does not include the tract.

2. Any person, or company of persons, who will send us *five dollars*, current money, at one time, free of expense, shall receive *five copies* of the Bible Examiner for 1849, and *forty* copies of the Six Sermons, 18mo. (pamphlet, including same as previous offer;) for *ten dollars*, *ten* copies of the Examiner, and *ninety* of the Sermons; for *twenty* dollars, *twenty* copies of the Examiner, and *two hundred* of the Sermons.

3. Any person, or company of persons, sending us $5, current money, free of expense, shall have 15 copies of Bible Examiner for 1849; for $10 they shall have 34 copies; and for $20, 75 copies.

We make these offers *now* to induce our friends to act at once in sending all the subscribers they can, that we may be able to form a judgment of the number of copies we shall print for 1849. The offers extend, therefore, only to January.

THE EDITOR of this paper preaches every Lord's day at COMMISSIONERS' HALL, Third street, below Green, east side; at 10½ A. M., and in the evening at 7 o'clock.

THE "SIX SERMONS" on the End of the Wicked, &c., can be had of the Author, 18 Chester street, between Race and Vine, 8th and 9th. Price, in Pamphlet, 15 cents, or ten copies for $1. The pamphlet includes the views of the author on the question, "Have the dead knowledge?" The Sermons advocate the doctrine, that "All the wicked will God *destroy*," or cause them to cease from life, after the judgment. The work full bound in morocco, with Grew's thoughts on the Intermediate State, 37½ cts. Cash in all cases with the order.

THE ASPECTS OF PHRENOLOGY ON REVELATION; or, *Materialism, Fatalism, Regeneration, Creeds, Atheism, The operation of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of men*, and HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY, *Philosophically considered in a series of Lectures*, BY J. T. WALSH." Such is the Title of an Octavo pamphlet of 74 pages, published by Br. Walsh, Richmond, Va., 1846. For sale at 18 Chester street, Philadelphia, Pa., and by the Author. *Price, 25 cents*, or five copies for one dollar, or thirty copies for five dollars. Cash always with the order.

INDEX TO VOL. III.

Annihilation—La Roy Sunderland, . . 20
Age to Come,—Bell's Letter.—Dr. Thomas' Reply, 27
Angels, ... 58
An Anti-Destructionist, ... 73
A Knotty Question, ... 107
A Fable,—Lamb, Wolf and dog, . . 159
Addenda, by Dr. Lees, Leeds, . . . 159
Anderson, H. T., Study of Prophecy, . . 173

Be Courteous, ... 40
Bishop Newton,—Eternal Torments, . . 44
Born of Water—Editorial, . . . 120
" " Homo, . . . 130
" " Magruder, . . . 165
Baptism, Queries by H. B. Hotchkiss, . . 150
" Reply to Hotchkiss, . . . 181

Christian Philosophy, . . . 81, 97, 129
Christian Fellowship, . . 92, 109, 117, 143
Creed Power, ... 93
Controversy, ... 120
Christian Sun,—Immortality, . . . 137
Clerical Misrepresentations, . . . 153

Death by Adam, ... 56
Dash them in Pieces, Psa. 2: 9, . . 73
Dr. Thomas' Rejoinder to H. Grew, . . 100
Death Threatened to Adam, not moral, &c., . 107
Dr. Tyng and the Truth, . . . 113
Dead Unconscious,—or Objections Answered, 151, 172

Europe and the Jews, ... 157

Future Punishment,—from Truth Seeker, 14, 29
Fancy Sketches, . . . 90, 106

Grew's Response to Dr. Thomas, . 68, 114
Grew, Thomas, and Magruder, . . 140, 148

Is the Devil a Friend, ... 24
Is Error consistent with Salvation, . . 35
Is Annihilation the Penalty of the Law—L. Lee and H. Grew, ... 52
Intermediate State,—Letter of P. M. Way, . 131

John Quincy Adams, ... 63

Kingdom of God, . . 1, 17, 49, 50, 65

Letters,—Charles Fitch, . . . 11, 55, 94
" From others, 47, 48, 77, 78, 79, 80, 94, 95, 96, 112, 127, 128, 160, 176, 185, 186.

Mental Diseases;—Strictures,—by Wm. H. Brewster, ... 145
Mind,—Reply to J. T. Walsh, by W. H. Brewster, ... 161, 176
Mortal and Immortal together, . . . 169

Nobility of Soul, ... 106

Phrenology,—Mr. Fowler,—Spiritualism, . . 21
Prophetic Periods, . . 5, 39, 57, 70, 109
Paganism in the 19th century, . . . 56
Philosophy of Man, . . 6, 22, 33, 67
Power of Churches, ... 25
Poetry, ... 80
Psa. 16 : 10, ... 106
Progress of Truth in Britain, by Dr. Lees, . 137
Prophecy of Zechariah, . . 154, 169
Penalty of Adam's Sin, . . . 170
Profit and Loss,—Sermon by Dr. Lees, . . 187

Revolution in France, ... 74
Rothschilds—Signs of the Times, . . 75
Raising of Samuel, ... 88
Renouncement of Sectarianism, . . . 93
Religious Zeal, ... 103
Reply to Questions, . . . 122, 139
Rich man and Lazarus, . . . 123
Resurrection—by Dr. Lees, Leeds, . . 156

Son of God—by H. Grew, 31, 62, 85, 110, 134
Signs of the Times, . . . 58, 122
Scarlet colored Beast, ... 88
Strictures on Dr. Thomas, &c., by Dr. Smith, . 142
She'ol, by Dr. Lees, Leeds, . . . 143
Scripture Psychology, . . . 164
Second Death—Bishop Whately, . . 167
Saints Reign in the Air, . . . 182

To be Remembered—Phrases, . . . 24
The Cause, ... 40
Tendencies of Immortal Soulism, . . 41
The Three Battles, ... 87
The Leaven at Work, ... 94
Truth Seekers, ... 104
The great Earthquake—another shock, . 121
Twenty-three Hundred Days, Dr. Fondey, . 175

Universalism, ... 23

Visit to Millville, ... 72

Wonders! Book of Eccl., ... 9
Would you inherit the Kingdom, . . . 42
Witchcraft Unveiled, . . . 5, 18, 34
" By Henry Jones, . . . 83
Why will ye Die, ... 93
Works advocating the Destruction of the Wicked, 160